arXiv:1602.00961v1 [math.OC] 2 Feb 2016

Conditional gradient type methods for composite nonlinear and stochastic optimization *

Saeed Ghadimi†

February 3, 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we present a conditional gradient type (CGT) method for solving a class of composite optimization problems where the objective function consists of a (weakly) smooth term and a strongly convex term. While including this strongly convex term in the subproblems of the classical conditional gradient (CG) method improves its convergence rate for solving strongly convex problems, it does not cost per iteration as much as general proximal type algorithms. Moreover, we show that existence of this strongly convex term enables us to establish convergence properties of the CGT method when the (weakly) smooth term is possibly nonconvex. In particular, we present a unified analysis for the CGT method in the sense that it achieves the best known convergence rate when the weakly smooth term is nonconvex and possesses (nearly) optimal complexity if it turns out to be convex (and hence the problem is strongly convex). While implementation of the CGT method requires explicitly estimating problem parameters like the level of smoothness for the weakly smooth term, we also present a few variants of this method which relax such estimation. Unlike general proximal type parameter free methods, these variants of the CGT method do not require any additional effort for computing (sub)gradients of the objective function and/or solving extra subproblems in each iteration. We then generalize these methods under stochastic setting and present a few new complexity results. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that such complexity results are presented for solving both weakly smooth nonconvex and strongly convex stochastic optimization problems.

keywords iteration complexity, nonconvex optimization, strongly convex optimization, conditional gradient type methods, unified methods, weakly smooth functions

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study a class of composite nonlinear programming problems given by

$$\Psi^* := \min_{x\in X}\{\Psi(x) := f(x) + h(x)\}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed convex set, $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable but possibly nonconvex, and h is a possibly non-differentiable μ-strongly convex function ($\mu > 0$) with known structure i.e.,

$$h(\alpha x + (1-\alpha)y) \le \alpha h(x) + (1-\alpha)h(y) - \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)\mu}{2}\|x-y\|^2 \tag{1.2}$$

for all $x, y \in X$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Moreover, we assume that f has Hölder continuous gradient on X i.e., there exists $L_\nu > 0$ for any $\nu \in (0, 1]$ such that

$$\|f'(y) - f'(x)\|_* \le L_\nu\|y - x\|^\nu \quad \forall x, y \in X, \tag{1.3}$$

*This research was supported by a grant from Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM).

†sghadimi@ipm.ir, School of Mathematics, IPM, P.O.Box: 19395-5746, Tehran, Iran.

where $f'(x)$ is the gradient of f at x and $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the dual norm. It can be easily verified that the above inequality implies that

$$|f(y) - f(x) - \langle f'(x), y - x\rangle| \leq \frac{L_\nu}{1+\nu}\|y - x\|^{1+\nu} \qquad \forall x, y \in X. \tag{1.4}$$

The assumption in (1.3) covers a wide range class of functions including smooth ($\nu = 1$) and weakly smooth ones ($\nu \in (0, 1)$). Different applications arise in the form of problem (1.1). In several machine learning problems, the objective function is given as summation of a loss function and a strongly convex regularization term where the loss function can be convex (see e.g., [13, 32]) or nonconvex (see e.g., [22, 2]). Signal processing problems using a strongly convex regularization term to avoid data overfitting also satisfy in the above setting (see e.g., [18]).

Problem (1.1) has been well-studied under different assumptions. Nesterov [26] showed that a variant of his well-known accelerated gradient (AG) method achieves the optimal iteration complexity $\mathcal{O}(\ln 1/\epsilon)$ for finding an ϵ-optimal solution of problem (1.1) i.e., a solution $\bar{x} \in X$ s.t. $\Psi(\bar{x}) - \Psi(x^*) \leq \epsilon$, when f is smooth and convex. Nemirovski and Nesterov [24] proposed an optimal proximal gradient type method which possesses the optimal complexity bound $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{\frac{1-\nu}{1+3\nu}})$ for solving weakly smooth strongly convex problems. This bound is also recently obtained in [29, 16]. When f is smooth and possibly nonconvex and h is only convex, the (projected) gradient type methods [1, 11, 25] have been proposed achieving the best known complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ to find an ϵ-stationary point of problem (1.1) i.e., having $\|g_{X,k}\|^2 \leq \epsilon$ for at least one iteration k (see (2.3) for definition of the so-called gradient mapping $g_{X,k}$ at the k-th iteration). Recently, Nesterov's AG method has been also generalized for nonconvex problems achieving the aforementioned complexity bound [10, 12]. It seems that strong convexity of h does not improve the complexity results when f is possibly nonconvex. Ghadimi et al. [12] also generalized the AG method and bundle level type methods which possess the complexity bound $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{\frac{1+\nu}{2\nu}})$ for finding ϵ-stationary point of weakly smooth nonconvex problems. These methods are also uniformly optimal in the sense that they automatically achieve the optimal complexity bound if the problem turns out to be convex. Such uniform methods have been developed before only for convex programming [19, 27]. All of the above-mentioned methods except the bundle level type methods, generally known as proximal type methods, require solving subproblems in the form of

$$\min_{u\in X}\{\langle f'(x), u\rangle + h(u) + \frac{1}{\gamma}V(u, x)\} \tag{1.5}$$

in each iteration, where γ is a stepsize and $V(u, x)$ is a strongly convex function usually referred to Bergman distance function given by $V(u, x) = \omega(u) - \omega(x) - \langle w'(x), u - x\rangle$ for a strongly convex so-called prox-function ω.

Different class of methods include subproblems in which only linear approximation of the objective function is minimized over a bounded feasible set. The classical conditional gradient (CG) method seems to be the eldest one first proposed by Frank and Wolfe in 1956 [6] and later widely used in the literature due to its low iteration cost (see e.g., [4, 5, 17, 7, 15, 21, 20]). While this class of problems generally achieves the iteration complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ for solving smooth strongly convex problems, some of them exhibit the linear convergence rate under specific conditions on the feasible set (see e.g., [30, 14, 7, 20]). Recently, Nesterov [28] showed that the CG method achieves the iteration complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{\frac{1}{\nu}})$ for solving weakly smooth strongly convex problems. He further considered the class of problems given by (1.1) and showed that by modifying the linear optimization in the subproblems of the CG method to

$$\min_{u\in X}\{\langle f'(x), u\rangle + h(u)\}, \tag{1.6}$$

we can obtain the complexity bound $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2\nu}})$ for solving problem (1.1) when f is weakly smooth and convex (Ψ is strongly convex).

Motivated by Nesterov's method in [28], our goal in this paper is to make a bridge between the classical CG method and general first-order methods including proximal type ones. Note that solving subproblem (1.5)

can be more difficult than the above one due to the choice of ω. For example, while subproblem (1.6) has a closed form solution for some choices of h, we may need an iterative algorithm to solve subproblem (1.5) due to the existence of Bergman distance function. Another example is when the prox-function is set to h. In this case, difficulty solving (1.6) and (1.5) are comparable. However, in most of algorithms, the prox-function ω is considered to be continuously differentiable which may not be true for h in our setting. Moreover, we need to compute the (sub)gradient of h to compute $V(u,x)$ when $\omega = h$. Hence, we save at least one computation of (sub)gradient of h in solving subproblem (1.6) which can make it easier than (1.5) when such computation is expensive. Also the stepsize γ in (1.5) usually depends on the problem parameters. Having no stepsize involved in (1.6), allows us to design a computationally much cheaper parameter free algorithm than those include subproblems in the form of (1.5) (see Algorithm 2 and the discussion after that for more details).

On the other hand, since variants the CG method require only linear programming in each iteration, their iteration costs can be cheaper than solving subproblem (1.6). It is also worth noting that while subproblems of the bundle level type methods can consist of objective functions similar to that of (1.6), their feasible sets in each iteration are changed and more complicated than X (see e.g., [19]). Indeed, iteration costs of these methods are computationally more expensive than the proximal type methods. Generally speaking, the iteration cost of the methods including subproblems in the forms of (1.6) lies between that of having linear programming in the subproblems like the classical CG method and general proximal type methods including subproblems in the form of (1.5). As we will show, the same fact holds for the iteration complexity of these methods. However, methods including (1.6) can have the same iteration complexity as the general proximal type methods under specific assumption on f in (1.1).

Our contribution in this paper consists of the following three aspects. Firstly, we present a conditional gradient type (CGT) method for solving problem (1.1) which only differs from the classical CG method in incorporating function h into the subproblems as shown in (1.6). We show that this type of subproblems allows us to establish the convergence of the CGT method when f is possibly nonconvex. In particular, we show that the number of iterations performed by the CGT method to find an ϵ-stationary point of problem (1.1) is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}\left\{\frac{L_\nu^{\frac{1}{\nu}}}{(\mu^2\epsilon)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2\nu}}}\right\}. \tag{1.7}$$

This bound, disregarding μ, is recently obtained by Ghadimi et al. [12] for a class of uniformly optimal first-order methods when applied to composite weakly smooth nonconvex problems. Note however, that while function h in (1.1) is assumed to be only convex in [12], their algorithms include subproblems in the form of (1.5) for the choice of $\omega(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|x\|_2^2$ and are more complicated than the CGT method. On the other hand, the aforementioned complexity bound for the CGT method is much improved to

$$\mathcal{O}\left\{\left(\frac{L_\nu^2}{\mu^2\epsilon^{1-\nu}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} \ln \frac{L_\nu^{\frac{1}{\nu}}}{(\mu^2\epsilon)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2\nu}}}\right\} \tag{1.8}$$

when f turns out to be convex (and hence Ψ is strongly convex). In this case, the above is also reduced to

$$\mathcal{O}\left\{\left(\frac{L_\nu^2}{\mu^2\epsilon^{1-\nu}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\nu}} \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right\} \tag{1.9}$$

for finding an ϵ-optimal solution of (1.1). This bound is worse than the optimal complexity bound $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{\frac{1-\nu}{1+3\nu}})$ for minimizing the class of weakly smooth strongly convex functions ([24, 29, 16]). Note however, that when f is smooth ($\nu = 1$), the bound in (1.9) is reduced to the optimal complexity bound $\mathcal{O}(\ln 1/\epsilon)$ for solving smooth strongly convex problems.

Secondly, while obtaining the above complexity bounds in (1.7), (1.8), and (1.9) requires explicitly estimating problem parameters L_ν, ν, and μ, we also present two variants of the CGT method which relaxes such estimation. In particular, we equip the CGT method with a line search procedure which only uses the strong convexity parameter of h from problem parameters in its implementation. Note that this parameter

μ is known due to our assumption about the structure of h. On the other hand, since there is no stepsize involved in the subproblem (1.6), this line search does not require any additional effort for extra computation of gradients of f and/or solving more subproblems. In this sense, this variant of the CGT method is computationally much cheaper per iteration than the other parameter free algorithms like the ones in [12, 29, 27] using subproblems in the form of (1.5) for solving weakly smooth problems. It is worth noting that such a parameter free algorithm is much more desirable in black-box optimization where only first-order information of f in (1.1) is given through an oracle and its convexity and level of smoothness may not be exactly known. We also present another variant of the CGT method which does not even use μ and any line search procedure. However, its complexity bounds are worse than the aforementioned ones for the CGT method (equipped with line search). We can improve these bounds by properly shrinking the feasible set and re-starting the algorithm which however, requires explicitly estimating the problem parameters.

Finally, we consider problem (1.1) under stochastic setting where only noisy first-order information of f is available via subsequent calls to a stochastic oracle ($\mathcal{SO}$). More specifically, when $\mathcal{SO}$ receives $x_k \in X$ as the input at the k-th call, it outputs stochastic gradient $G(x_k, \xi_k)$, where $\{\xi_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ are random vectors whose distributions P_k are supported on $\Xi_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. The following assumption is made for the stochastic gradients returned by the $\mathcal{SO}$.

Assumption 1 *For any $x \in X$ and $k \geq 1$, we have*

$$a) \quad \mathbb{E}[G(x, \xi_k)] = f'(x), \tag{1.10}$$

$$b) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\|G(x, \xi_k) - f'(x)\|_*^2\right] \leq \sigma^2. \tag{1.11}$$

We present a randomized stochastic CGT (RSCGT) method for solving problem (1.1) when f is smooth ($\nu = 1$). We show that the total number of calls to the $\mathcal{SO}$ performed by the RSCGT method to have $\mathbb{E}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \epsilon$ is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}\left\{\frac{(\mu + L_1)\sigma^2}{\mu^4\epsilon^2}\right\}.$$

Here the expectation is taken with respect to ξ and R, where R is a discrete random variable whose probability mass function is supported on $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ for some given iteration limit $N \geq 1$. This type of randomized stochastic gradient methods was first proposed by Ghadimi and Lan [9] and later used in [11, 10, 3] achieving the aforementioned complexity bound (after disregarding μ) for smooth (un)constrained nonconvex stochastic optimization. Moreover, the above bound is much improved to

$$\mathcal{O}\left\{\frac{(\mu + L_1)\sigma^2}{\mu^3\epsilon}\ln\left[\frac{\mu + L_1}{\mu^2\epsilon}\right]\right\}$$

when f is convex. In this case, the RSCGT method achieves the complexity bound $\mathcal{O}\left\{\frac{(\mu+L_1)\sigma^2}{\mu^2\epsilon}\ln\left[\frac{\mu+L_1}{\mu\epsilon}\right]\right\}$ for finding a solution $\bar{x} \in X$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\Psi(\bar{x}) - \Psi(x^*)] \leq \epsilon$ which is optimal up to a logarithmic constant for solving smooth strongly convex stochastic optimization problems in terms of dependence on the accuracy ϵ (see e.g., [23, 8]). While the above results are obtained when f is smooth, we show that by different choice of stepsizes, the RSCGT method can be applicable to problem (1.1) when f is not necessarily smooth. In particular, we show that complexity of the RSCGT method is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}\left\{\frac{L_\nu^{\frac{1+2\nu}{\nu}}\sigma^2}{(\mu^2\epsilon)^{\frac{1+4\nu}{2\nu}}}\right\}$$

when f is possibly nonconvex. Using the similar idea of shrinking the feasible set, the above bound is much improved to

$$\mathcal{O}\left\{\frac{L_\nu^{\frac{1}{\nu}}\sigma^2}{\mu(\mu^2\epsilon)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2\nu}}}\right\}$$

when f is convex which is optimal for smooth strongly convex stochastic optimization. To the best our knowledge, this is the first time that such complexity results are presented for solving both weakly smooth nonconvex and strongly convex stochastic optimization problems.

Rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present the CGT method and its variants with establishing their convergence properties for solving problem (1.1). In Section 3, we generalize some of our results to the stochastic setting of problem (1.1). Finally, we conclude the paper by some remarks in Section 4.

Notation. For a differentiable function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, $h'(x)$ is the gradient of h at x. More generally, when h is a proper convex function, $\partial h(x)$ denotes the subdifferential set of h at x. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\langle x, y\rangle$ is the standard inner product in $\mathbb{R}^n$. The norm $\|\cdot\|$ is a general norm. For any real number r, $\lceil r \rceil$ and $\lfloor r \rfloor$ denote the nearest integer to r from above and below, respectively.

2 Conditional gradient type methods for composite optimization

Out goal in this section is to present a conditional gradient type (CGT) method for solving problem (1.1). Note that the classical CG method cannot be directly applied to this problem since h is not necessarily differentiable. However, it is shown that if h Lipschitz continuous, then it can be approximated by using some smoothing techniques and hence the CG method can be used for solving problem (1.1) when f is smooth and convex [20]. Different from the classical CG method, we minimize summation of the strongly convex function h and a linearization of function f in the subproblems of the CGT method. Throughout this section, we assume that f satisfies in (1.3).

Below we precisely describe the conditional gradient type (CGT) method.

Algorithm 1 The conditional gradient type (CGT) algorithm

Input: $x_0 \in X$, $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geq 1} \in (0, 1]$.

0. Set $y_0 = x_0$ and $k = 1$.

1. Compute $f'(y_{k-1})$ and set

$$x_k = \arg\min_{u\in X} \{\langle f'(y_{k-1}), u\rangle + h(u)\}, \tag{2.1}$$

$$y_k = (1 - \alpha_k)y_{k-1} + \alpha_k x_k, \tag{2.2}$$

2. Set $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to step 1.

We now add a few remarks about the above algorithm. First, note that as mentioned above, the CGT method only differs from the CG method in the existence of h in subproblem (2.1). As we will show, while this can make the subproblems harder to solve, it improves the convergence rate of the CG method for solving strongly convex problems. Moreover, it allows us to provide the convergence results of the CGT method when f is possibly nonconvex.

Second, as mentioned in Section 1, if h is chosen as the prox function, then difficulty of solving subproblem (2.1) is equivalent to that of general first-order methods. However, in this method the prox function is usually considered to be continuously differentiable which is not true for $h(x)$ in our setting. On the other hand, while we do not linearize h in (2.1). Hence, the updating step of the CGT method can be computationally much cheaper than that of general first-order methods when computing (sub)gradient of h is not easy.

Third, since f is possibly nonconvex in (1.1), we need to define a different termination criterion to establish the convergence of our method. To do so, we define gradient mapping at point $x_k \in X$ as follows.

$$g_{X,k} = y_{k-1} - x_k. \tag{2.3}$$

The equivalent definitions have been widely used based on updating step of different algorithms (see e.g., [26, 10]). Note that by the optimality condition of (2.1), for some $p_h \in \partial h(x_k)$ and $p_\Psi \in \partial \Psi(x_k)$, we have

$$f'(y_{k-1}) + p_h \in -\mathcal{N}_X(x_k) \to f'(y_{k-1}) - f'(x_k) + p_\Psi \in -\mathcal{N}_X(x_k), \tag{2.4}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_X(x)$ shows the normal cone at $x \in X$. Moreover, by (1.3), we have

$$\|f'(y_{k-1}) - f'(x_k)\|_* \le L_v \|y_{k-1} - x_k\|^\nu = L_v \|g_{X,k}\|^\nu.$$

Hence, as $g_{X,k}$ vanishes, we obtain an approximate stationary point of problem (1.1).

Before providing the convergence analysis of the CGT method, we present the following simple result which will be used in our analysis.

Lemma 1 *Let the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\ge 0}$ be generated by Algorithm 1. Then, for any $k \ge 1$, we have*

$$\langle f'(y_{k-1}), x_k - u\rangle + h(x_k) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x_k - u\|^2 \le h(u) \quad \forall u \in X. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. Noting (2.4), the strong convexity of h, for any $u \in X$ and some $p_h \in \partial h(x_k)$, we have

$$\langle f'(y_{k-1}) + p_h, u - x_k\rangle \ge 0 \ \text{ and } \ h(u) \ge h(x_k) + \langle p_h, u - x_k\rangle + \frac{\mu}{2}\|u - x_k\|^2,$$

which clearly imply (2.5). ∎

We are now ready to establish the convergence properties of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 2 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\ge 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 1.*

a) If stepsizes $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\ge 1}$ are chosen such that $\alpha_1 = 1$ and

$$0 < \frac{\alpha_k^\nu}{1 - 2\alpha_k} \le \frac{(1+\nu)\mu}{2\theta L_\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1-\nu} \ \ \forall k \ge 2 \tag{2.6}$$

for some $\theta > 1$, then for any $N \ge 1$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\alpha_k \|g_{X,k}\|\right)^{1+\nu} \le \frac{(1+\nu)[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*]}{(\theta - 1)L_\nu} + \frac{\theta}{\theta - 1}\|x_1 - x_0\|^{1+\nu}. \tag{2.7}$$

If, in addition, f is convex, then for any $N \ge 1$, we have

$$A_N^{-1}\bar{\Psi}_N(u) + \frac{(\theta-1)L_\nu}{1+\nu}\sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\left(\alpha_k\|g_{X,k}\|\right)^{1+\nu} \le \frac{\theta L_\nu \|x_1 - x_0\|^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu} \ \ \forall u \in X, \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$\bar{\Psi}_k(u) = \Psi(y_k) - \Psi(u) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|y_k - u\|^2 \quad \forall k \ge 0 \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$A_N = A_1 \prod_{k=2}^N (1 - \alpha_k), \qquad A_1 = \begin{cases} 1 & \alpha_1 = 1, \\ 1 - \alpha_1 & \alpha_1 < 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

b) If stepsizes $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\ge 1}$ are chosen such that (2.6) holds for any $k \ge 1$, then for any $N \ge 1$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \left(\alpha_k \|g_{X,k}\|\right)^{1+\nu} \le \frac{(1+\nu)[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*]}{(\theta - 1)L_\nu}. \tag{2.11}$$

If, in addition, f is convex, then for any $N \ge 1$, we have

$$A_N^{-1}\bar{\Psi}_N(u) + \frac{(\theta-1)L_\nu}{1+\nu}\sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\left(\alpha_k\|g_{X,k}\|\right)^{1+\nu} \le \bar{\Psi}_0(u) \ \ \forall u \in X. \tag{2.12}$$

Proof. We first show part a). Noting (1.4) and (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_k) &\leq f(y_{k-1}) + \langle f'(y_{k-1}), y_k - y_{k-1}\rangle + \frac{L_\nu}{1+\nu}\|y_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} \\ &= f(y_{k-1}) + \alpha_k\langle f'(y_{k-1}), x_k - y_{k-1}\rangle + \frac{L_\nu \alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} \\ &= (1-\alpha_k) f(y_{k-1}) + \alpha_k[f(y_{k-1}) + \langle f'(y_{k-1}), x_k - y_{k-1}\rangle] + \frac{L_\nu \alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu}. \quad (2.13) \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (2.5) by α_k and adding it to the above inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_k) &\leq (1-\alpha_k) f(y_{k-1}) + \alpha_k[f(y_{k-1}) + \langle f'(y_{k-1}), u - y_{k-1}\rangle + h(u) - h(x_k) - \frac{\mu}{2}\|x_k - u\|^2] \\ &+ \frac{L_\nu \alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} \quad \forall u \in X. \quad (2.14) \end{aligned}$$

Letting $u = y_{k-1}$ in the above relation, we have

$$f(y_k) \leq f(y_{k-1}) + \alpha_k[h(y_{k-1}) - h(x_k) - \frac{\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2] + \frac{L_\nu \alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu}.$$

Also noting (1.2) and (2.2), we have

$$h(y_k) \leq (1-\alpha_k) h(y_{k-1}) + \alpha_k h(x_k) - \frac{\alpha_k(1-\alpha_k)\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2. \quad (2.15)$$

Adding the above inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(y_k) &\leq \Psi(y_{k-1}) - \frac{\alpha_k(2-\alpha_k)\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{L_\nu \alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} \\ &= \Psi(y_{k-1}) - \frac{\alpha_k}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu}\left[(2-\alpha_k)\mu\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1-\nu} - \frac{2L_\nu \alpha_k^\nu}{1+\nu}\right], \quad (2.16) \end{aligned}$$

which after re-arranging the terms, noting the fact that $\alpha_1 = 1$, and (2.6) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\theta-1)L_\nu \alpha_1^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_1 - x_0\|^{1+\nu} &\leq \Psi(x_0) - \Psi(y_1) + \frac{\theta L_\nu}{1+\nu}\|x_1 - x_0\|^{1+\nu}, \\ \frac{(\theta-1)L_\nu \alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} &\leq \Psi(y_{k-1}) - \Psi(y_k) \quad \forall k \geq 2. \quad (2.17) \end{aligned}$$

Summing up the above inequalities and noting the fact that $\Psi^* \leq \Psi(y_k) \ \ \forall k \geq 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{(\theta-1)L_\nu}{1+\nu}\sum_{k=1}^{N}(\alpha_k\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|)^{1+\nu} \leq \Psi(x_0) - \Psi^* + \frac{\theta L_\nu}{1+\nu}\|x_1 - x_0\|^{1+\nu},$$

which in the view of (2.3), clearly implies (2.7).

Now suppose also that f is convex. Noting (2.2) and strong convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$, we have

$$\|y_k - u\|^2 \leq (1-\alpha_k)\|y_{k-1} - u\|^2 + \alpha_k\|x_k - u\|^2 \ \ \forall u \in X.$$

Multiplying the above relation with $\mu/2$, adding it up with (2.14), (2.15), and noting the convexity of f, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(y_k) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|y_k - u\|^2 &\leq (1-\alpha_k)\left[\Psi(y_{k-1}) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|y_{k-1} - u\|^2\right] + \alpha_k\Psi(u) - \frac{\alpha_k(1-\alpha_k)\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{L_\nu \alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu}, \quad (2.18) \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting $\Psi(u)$ from both sides of the above inequality, diving them by A_k, noting (2.10), the fact that $\alpha_1 = 1$, and (2.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\theta-1)L_\nu \alpha_1^{1+\nu}}{(1+\nu)A_1}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} + \frac{\bar{\Psi}_1(u)}{A_1} &\leq \frac{\theta L_\nu}{(1+\nu)}\|x_1 - x_0\|^{1+\nu} \\ \frac{(\theta-1)L_\nu \alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{(1+\nu)A_k}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} + \frac{\bar{\Psi}_k(u)}{A_k} &\leq \frac{\bar{\Psi}_{k-1}(u)}{A_{k-1}} \quad \forall k \geq 2, \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

where $\bar{\Psi}_k(u)$ is defined in (2.9). Summing up the above inequalities, we clearly obtain (2.8).

We now show part b).If (2.6) holds for any $k \geq 1$, then (2.17) and (2.19) hold for any $k \geq 1$ for nonconvex and convex problems, respectively. Hence, (2.11) and (2.12) are immediately obtained by summing up these inequalities. ∎

Observe that the convergence results in Theorem 2 rely on the choice of stepsizes $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ which should also satisfy (2.6). Below, we specialize these results for specific choice of stepsizes.

Corollary 3 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 1 and a target accuracy $\epsilon > 0$ is given. Moreover, let $N+1$ be the first iteration that size of the gradient mapping is not greater than ϵ i.e.,*

$$\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 > \epsilon \quad k = 1, \ldots, N, \qquad \|x_{N+1} - y_N\|^2 \leq \epsilon. \tag{2.20}$$

a) If X is bounded, Ψ is bounded from below, $\alpha_1 = 1$, and $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geq 2}$ are set to

$$\alpha_k = \left(\frac{\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1-\nu}}{2\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1-\nu} + \frac{2\theta L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\nu}} \quad \forall k \geq 2 \tag{2.21}$$

for some $\theta > 1$, then we have

$$\|g_{X,N+1}\|^{1+\nu} = \min_{k=1,\ldots,N+1} \|g_{X,k}\|^{1+\nu} \leq \frac{(1+\nu)}{(\theta-1)L_\nu N \alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{1+\nu}} \left[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^* + \frac{\theta L_\nu D_X^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu} \right], \tag{2.22}$$

where

$$\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu} = \left(\frac{\epsilon^{\frac{1-\nu}{2}}}{2\epsilon^{\frac{1-\nu}{2}} + \frac{2\theta L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\nu}}. \tag{2.23}$$

If, in addition, f is convex and an optimal solution x^* exists for problem (1.1), then we have

$$\|g_{X,N+1}\|^{1+\nu} = \min_{k=1,\ldots,N} \|g_{X,k}\|^{1+\nu} \leq \frac{\theta(1-\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu})^{N-1} D_X^{1+\nu}}{(\theta-1)\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{1+\nu}}, \tag{2.24}$$

$$\bar{\Psi}_N(x^*) \leq \frac{\theta L_\nu (1-\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu})^{N-1} D_X^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}, \tag{2.25}$$

where $\bar{\Psi}_k(x^*)$ is defined in (2.9).

b) If Ψ is bounded from below and (2.21) holds for any $k \geq 1$, then we have

$$\|g_{X,N+1}\|^{1+\nu} \leq \frac{(1+\nu)\left[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*\right]}{(\theta-1)L_\nu N \alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{1+\nu}}. \tag{2.26}$$

If, in addition, f is convex and an optimal solution x^* exists for problem (1.1), then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_{X,N+1}\|^{1+\nu} &\leq \frac{(1+\nu)(1-\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu})^N \bar{\Psi}_0(x^*)}{(\theta-1)L_\nu \alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{1+\nu}}, \qquad (2.27) \\ \bar{\Psi}_N(x^*) &\leq (1-\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu})^N \bar{\Psi}_0(x^*). \qquad (2.28) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First, observe that by the choice of stepsizes in (2.21) and the facts that $\nu, \alpha_k \in (0,1]$, we have

$$0 < \frac{\alpha_k^\nu}{1-2\alpha_k} < \frac{\alpha_k^\nu}{1-2\alpha_k^\nu} = \frac{(1+\nu)\mu}{2\theta L_\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1-\nu},$$

which clearly implies that (2.6) is satisfied. Also noting (2.21), the fact that $\alpha_k \geq \alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}$ $k = 1, \ldots, N$ due to the fact that $\alpha_1 = 1$ and the assumption in (2.20), and in the view of (2.3), we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\alpha_k \|g_{X,k}\|\right)^{1+\nu} \geq \sum_{k=1}^{N} \alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{1+\nu} \|g_{X,k}\|^{1+\nu} \geq N\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{1+\nu} \|g_{X,N+1}\|^{1+\nu} = N\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{1+\nu} \min_{k=1,\ldots,N+1} \|g_{X,k}\|^{1+\nu}. \tag{2.29}$$

Combining the above relation and (2.7), we clearly obtain (2.22).

Second, noting that $\alpha_1 = 1$, $\alpha_k \geq \alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}$ $k = 1, \ldots, N$, and (2.10), we have

$$A_N = A_1 \prod_{k=2}^{N}(1-\alpha_k) \leq \prod_{k=2}^{N}(1-\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}) = (1-\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu})^{N-1}, \tag{2.30}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \alpha_k^{1+\nu} A_k^{-1} &\geq \alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{1+\nu}\left[1 + \sum_{k=2}^{N}(1-\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu})^{-k+1}\right] = \alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{\nu}(1-\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu})[(1-\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu})^{-N} - 1] \\ &\geq \frac{\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{1+\nu}}{(1-\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu})^{N-1}}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

$$\tag{2.32}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu} \leq 1$. Combining the above relations with (2.8) (by letting $u = x^*$), noting that $\sum_{k=1}^{N} A_k^{-1}\left(\alpha_k\|g_{X,k}\|\right)^{1+\nu} \geq \|g_{X,N+1}\|^{1+\nu}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\alpha_k^{1+\nu}A_k^{-1}$, and $\Psi_N(x^*) \geq 0$, we obtain (2.24) and (2.25).

Third, note that (2.29), (2.30), and (2.31) (in both of which $N-1$ is replaced by N) still hold when (2.21) is also set for $k = 1$. Hence, part b) follows similarly to part a). ∎

We now add a few remarks about the above results. First, observe the above results in part a) require the boundedness assumption on the feasible set X. However, dependence of these results on ϵ ($\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}$) is the same as those in part b). Therefore, for sake of simplicity and relaxing the boundedness assumption, we focus on the results in part b). Second, observe that by (2.23) and convexity of the univariate function $x \to x^r (r > 1)$ on $(0, \infty)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_{\epsilon,\nu}^{1+\nu}} = 2^{\frac{1+\nu}{\nu}}\left[1 + \frac{\theta L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu\epsilon^{\frac{1-\nu}{2}}}\right]^{\frac{1+\nu}{\nu}} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{\nu}} + 2^{\frac{1}{\nu}}\left[\frac{\theta L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu\epsilon^{\frac{1-\nu}{2}}}\right]^{\frac{1+\nu}{\nu}} \tag{2.33}$$

which together with (2.26), imply that the total number of iterations performed by Algorithm 1 to have $\|g_{X,k}\|^2 \leq \epsilon$ for at least one k, is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}(1)[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*]\left[\frac{1}{L_\nu \epsilon^{\frac{1+\nu}{2}}} + \frac{L_\nu^{\frac{1}{\nu}}}{(\mu^2\epsilon)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2\nu}}}\right], \tag{2.34}$$

where $\mathcal{O}(1)$ shows a positive constant. The above bound (when the second term is the dominating one) is recently obtained by Ghadimi et al. [12] for a class of gradient type methods when applied to weakly smooth nonconvex problems. However, their methods do not require the knowledge of problem parameters in advance. This bound is also derived in [31] for the gradient descent method when the problems is unconstrained. It should be also mentioned that when $\nu = 1$, the bound in (2.34) is reduced to the best known complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ for solving smooth nonconvex problems.

Third, observe that if f is convex (Ψ is strongly convex), then we have $\bar{\Psi}_0(x^*) \leq 2[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi(x^*)]$. Using this observation, the above-mentioned ones in (2.33), (2.27), and the fact that $(1 + x/N)^N \leq e^x$, we conclude that the total number of iterations performed by Algorithm 1 to have $\|g_{X,k}\|^2 \leq \epsilon$ for at least one k, is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}(1) \max\left\{1, \left(\frac{L_\nu^2}{\mu^2 \epsilon^{1-\nu}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}\right\} \left(\ln \frac{\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*}{L_\nu \epsilon^{\frac{1+\nu}{2}}} + \ln \frac{[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*] L_\nu^{\frac{1}{\nu}}}{(\mu^2 \epsilon)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2\nu}}}\right), \tag{2.35}$$

which is much better than (2.34) in terms of dependence on the target accuracy ϵ. Note that when $\nu = 1$, the above bound is reduced to $\log 1/\epsilon$ for smooth strongly convex problems.

Fourth, due to (2.28), the complexity bound (2.35) is reduced to

$$\mathcal{O}(1) \max\left\{1, \left(\frac{L_\nu^2}{\mu^2 \epsilon^{1-\nu}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}\right\} \ln\left(\frac{\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*}{\epsilon}\right). \tag{2.36}$$

for fining a solution $\bar{x} \in X$ such that $\Psi(\bar{x}) - \Psi(x^*) \leq \epsilon$. This bound is much better than $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{\frac{1}{\nu}})$ for the classical CG method and $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2\nu}})$ obtained by Nesterov [28] for Algorithm 1 with different stepsize policy not depending on the problem parameters. However, the above bound is worse than the lower complexity bound $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{\frac{1-\nu}{1+3\nu}})$ for weakly smooth strongly convex problems which is achieved by a few more complicated first-order methods [29, 16]. It should be also mentioned that these methods do not consider the composite setting. On the other hand, the bounds in (2.35) and (2.36) guarantee the linear convergence rate for Algorithm 1 when f is smooth and convex.

Finally, note that the stepsize policy in (2.21) depends on the problem parameters like ν and L_ν which may not be known exactly. Below, we present a variant of Algorithm 1 which does not require this knowledge of parameters in advance.

Algorithm 2 The conditional gradient type algorithm with line search

Input: $x_0 \in X$, $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 1} \in (0, 1]$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and $\delta > 0$.

0. Set $y_0 = x_0$ and $k = 1$.
1. Compute $f'(y_{k-1})$ and set x_k to (2.1).
2. Set y_k to (2.2) with the choice of

$$\alpha_k = \gamma^{t_k} \quad \forall k \geq 1, \tag{2.37}$$

where $t_k \geq 1$ is the smallest integer number such that

$$\Psi(y_k) \leq (1 - \alpha_k)\Psi(y_{k-1}) + \alpha_k[f(y_{k-1}) + \langle f'(y_{k-1}), x_k - y_{k-1}\rangle + h(x_k)] - \frac{\alpha_k \mu}{4}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \delta\alpha_k \tag{2.38}$$

holds.

3. Set $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to step 1.

Note that in the framework of the CGT method, y_k is indeed a weighted average of x_i $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k$ due to (2.2). Hence, purpose of the line search procedure defined in (2.37) and (2.38) is only to find the appropriate choice of α_k to specify these weights. Similar procedures have been also used for weakly smooth convex and nonconvex problems in [27, 12]. For each run of these line search procedures, a new subproblem is to be solved and gradient of the objective function at a new point may be required to be computed. Note however, that our procedure does not require this additional effort and hence it is computationally much cheaper per iteration. In the next result, we show that the line search procedure defined in Step 2 of Algorithm 2 is run only for a finite number of times and hence the complexity of this algorithm is similar to that of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 4 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 2.*

a) The procedure (2.38) is well-defined in the sense that t_k in (2.37) is finite for any $k \geq 1$.

b) If Ψ is bounded from below, then for any $N \geq 1$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} \alpha_k \|g_{X,k}\|^2 \leq \frac{4}{3\mu}\left[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^* + \delta \sum_{k=1}^{N} \alpha_k\right]. \tag{2.39}$$

c) If, in addition, f is convex, then for any $N \geq 1$, we have

$$4A_N^{-1}\bar{\Psi}_N(u) + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mu\alpha_k A_k^{-1}\|g_{X,k}\|^2 \leq 4\bar{\Psi}_0(u) + 4\delta \sum_{k=1}^{N} \alpha_k A_k^{-1} \quad \forall u \in X. \tag{2.40}$$

where A_k is defined in (2.10) and $\bar{\Psi}_k(u)$ is defined in (2.9).

Proof. We first show part a). Note that by Hölder inequality $ab \leq a^p/p + b^q/q$ with $p = \frac{2}{1+\nu}$ and $q = \frac{2}{1-\nu}$ for $\nu \in (0,1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{L_\nu(\alpha_k\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|)^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu} &= \alpha_k\left(\frac{L_\nu\alpha_k^\nu\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\left[\frac{(1-\nu)}{2\delta}\right]^{\frac{1-\nu}{2}}\right)\left[\frac{2\delta}{(1-\nu)}\right]^{\frac{1-\nu}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\hat{L}_{\nu,\delta}\alpha_k^{\frac{1+3\nu}{1+\nu}}}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \delta\alpha_k,\end{aligned} \tag{2.41}$$

where

$$\hat{L}_{\nu,\delta} = \left\{\frac{L_\nu}{\left[\frac{2(1+\nu)\delta}{1-\nu}\right]^{\frac{1-\nu}{2}}}\right\}^{\frac{2}{1+\nu}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{L}_{1,\delta} = \lim_{\nu\to 1}\hat{L}_{\nu,\delta} = L_1. \tag{2.42}$$

Combining the above relation with (2.13) and (2.15), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(y_k) \leq (1-\alpha_k)\Psi(y_{k-1}) &+ \alpha_k[f(y_{k-1} + \langle f'(y_{k-1}), x_k - y_{k-1}\rangle + h(x_k)] + \delta\alpha_k \\ &- \frac{\alpha_k\mu}{2}\left[1 - \alpha_k - \frac{\hat{L}_{\nu,\delta}\alpha_k^{\frac{2\nu}{1+\nu}}}{\mu}\right]\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

Noting $\alpha_k \leq \alpha_k^{\frac{2\nu}{1+\nu}}$ due to the facts that $\nu, \alpha_k \in (0,1]$, if

$$\alpha_k \leq \left(\frac{1}{2\left[1 + \hat{L}_{\nu,\delta}/\mu\right]}\right)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2\nu}} := \alpha_{\delta,\nu}, \tag{2.44}$$

then (2.43) clearly implies (2.38). Observe that the above upper bound on α_k is fixed and less than 1. Hence, this observation and (2.37) imply that the line search procedure defined in (2.38) is terminated in finite steps.

We now show part b). Assume that (2.38) holds. Letting $u = y_{k-1}$ in (2.5), multiplying its both sides by α_k and adding it to (2.38), we obtain

$$\Psi(y_k) \leq \Psi(y_{k-1}) - \frac{3\alpha_k\mu}{4}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \delta\alpha_k.$$

Summing up the above inequalities, re-arranging the terms, noting the fact that $\Psi^* \leq \Psi(x_N)$, and in the view of (2.3), we clearly obtain (2.39).

To show part c), assume that f is convex. Noting (2.5), (2.38), convexity of f, and similar to (2.18), we have

$$\Psi(y_k) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|y_k - u\|^2 \leq (1-\alpha_k)\left[\Psi(y_{k-1}) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|y_{k-1} - u\|^2\right] + \alpha_k\Psi(u) - \frac{\alpha_k\mu}{4}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \delta\alpha_k.$$

Rest of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 2. b) and hence we skip the details. ∎

Observe that the line search procedure defined in Step 2 of Algorithm 2 is performed up to a constant number $\ln \alpha_{\delta,\nu}/\ln \gamma$ per iteration due to (2.44). Using this observation, we specify the convergence of Algorithm 2 in the next result.

Corollary 5 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 1 and stepsizes are chosen according to (2.37) and (2.38).*

a) If Ψ is bounded from below, then for any $N \geq 1$, we have

$$\min_{k=1,2,\ldots,N} \|g_{X,k}\|^2 \leq \frac{4}{3\mu}\left[\frac{\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*}{N\gamma\alpha_{\delta,\nu}} + \delta\right], \tag{2.45}$$

where $\alpha_{\delta,\nu}$ is defined in (2.44).

b) If, in addition, f is convex and an optimal solution x^* exists for problem (1.1), then for any $N \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{k=1,2,\ldots,N} \|g_{X,k}\|^2 &\leq \frac{4}{\mu}\left[\frac{(1-\gamma\alpha_{\delta,\nu})^N \bar{\Psi}_0(x^*)}{\gamma\alpha_{\delta,\nu}} + \delta\right], &(2.46)\\ \bar{\Psi}_N(x^*) &\leq (1-\gamma\alpha_{\delta,\nu})^N \bar{\Psi}_0(x^*) + \delta. &(2.47)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. First, note that by (2.37) and (2.44), we have $\alpha_k \geq \gamma\alpha_{\delta,\nu}$ which together with (2.10) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k &\geq N\gamma\alpha_{\delta,\nu},\\ A_N &= A_1\prod_{k=2}^N(1-\alpha_k) = \prod_{k=1}^N(1-\alpha_k) \leq (1-\gamma\alpha_{\delta,\nu})^N,\\ \sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_k^{-1} &= \alpha_1 A_1^{-1} + \sum_{k=2}^N \alpha_k A_k^{-1} = \alpha_1 A_1^{-1} + \sum_{k=2}^N (1 - A_k A_{k-1}^{-1})A_k^{-1} = \alpha_1 A_1^{-1} + \sum_{k=2}^N (A_k^{-1} - A_{k-1}^{-1})\\ &= A_N^{-1} - (1-\alpha_1)A_1^{-1} = A_N^{-1} - 1 \geq \frac{1-(1-\gamma\alpha_{\delta,\nu})^N}{A_N} \geq \frac{\gamma\alpha_{\delta,\nu}}{(1-\gamma\alpha_{\delta,\nu})^N},\\ A_N\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k A_k^{-1} &= 1 - A_N \leq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.48}$$

Combining the above relations with (2.39) and (2.40), we obtain (2.45), (2.46), and (2.47). ∎

We now add a few remarks about the above results. First, observe that by (2.44) and similar to (2.33), we have

$$\alpha_{\delta,\nu}^{-1} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{\nu}}\left[1 + \left(\frac{\hat{L}_{\nu,\delta}}{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2\nu}}\right],$$

which together with the choice of $\delta = (\mu\epsilon)/8$, (2.42), and (2.45) imply that the number of iterations performed by Algorithm 2, to have $\|g_{X,k}\|^2 \leq \epsilon$ for at least one k is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}(1)[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*]\left[\frac{1}{\mu\epsilon} + \frac{L_\nu^{\frac{1}{\nu}}}{(\mu^2\epsilon)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2\nu}}}\right], \tag{2.49}$$

which is the same as (2.34) when the second terms are the dominating ones in both bounds. Note however, that unlike (2.34), we do not need to know ν and L_ν to obtain this bound. Moreover, while such a prior knowledge of problem parameters is not required in [12] to obtain the similar bound for nonconvex problems, its line search procedure is computationally more expensive than the one in (2.38) as mentioned before.

Second, when f is convex, the above observation and choice of δ together with (2.46) imply that the complexity of Algorithm 2 for finding the aforementioned ϵ-approximate stationary point of problem (1.1), can be bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}(1)\max\left\{1,\left(\frac{L_\nu^2}{\mu^2\epsilon^{1-\nu}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}\right\}\left(\ln\frac{\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*}{\mu\epsilon}+\ln\frac{[\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*]L_\nu^{\frac{1}{\nu}}}{(\mu^2\epsilon)^{\frac{1+\nu}{2\nu}}}\right), \tag{2.50}$$

which is the same as (2.35) when the second terms are the dominating ones in both bounds.

Third, the above choice of δ together with (2.47) imply that the iteration complexity of Algorithm 2 for finding a solution $\bar{x}\in X$ such that $\Psi(\bar{x})-\Psi(x^*)\le\mu\epsilon$ is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}(1)\max\left\{1,\left(\frac{L_\nu^2}{\mu^2\epsilon^{1-\nu}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}\right\}\ln\frac{\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*}{\mu\epsilon}. \tag{2.51}$$

This bound will be the same as (2.36) when $\delta=\epsilon/2$. However, in this case, the accuracy for $\|g_{_{X,k}}\|^2$ is changed to ϵ/μ.

Finally, note that while we need to know the strong convexity parameter of h and fix the target accuracy ϵ to obtain the above complexity bounds, other problem parameters like L_ν and the level of smoothness ν are not required to be known in advance. Below, we present another variant of Algorithm 1 which its implementation is totally independent of all problem parameters. However, its complexity bounds are worse than the ones we obtained for the CGT (with line search procedure) method.

Algorithm 3 The folded conditional gradient type (FCGT) algorithm

Input: $x_0\in X$, $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\ge1}\in(0,1]$, and $\{\beta_k\}_{k\ge1}\in(0,1]$.

0. Set the initial points $x_0=y_0$ and $k=1$.
1. Compute $f'(y_{k-1})$ and set x_k to (2.1).
2. Choose y_k such that $\Psi(y_k)=\min\{\Psi(\hat{y}_k),\Psi(\tilde{y}_k)\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{y}_k &= (1-\alpha_k)y_{k-1}+\alpha_k x_k,\\ \tilde{y}_k &= (1-\beta_k)y_{k-1}+\beta_k x_k.\end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

2. Set $k\leftarrow k+1$ and go to step 1.

Note that the above algorithm only differs from Algorithm 1 in updating the sequence $\{y_k\}_{k\ge0}$. In particular, two folded sequences $\{\hat{y}_k\}_{k\ge0}$ and $\{\tilde{y}_k\}_{k\ge0}$ are generated by taking different convex combination of y_{k-1} and x_k and y_k is set to the one with smaller objective value. This way of updating y_k, as shown in the next result, allows us to have two different stepsize policies for nonconvex and strongly convex problems which are totally independent of the problem parameters.

Theorem 6 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k,y_k\}_{k\ge0}$ is generated by Algorithm 3 and X is bounded.*

a) If Ψ is bounded from below, then for any $N\ge1$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^N\beta_k(1-\beta_k)\|g_{_{X,k}}\|^2\le\frac{2}{\mu}[\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*]+\mathcal{C}_\nu^2\sum_{k=1}^N\beta_k^{1+2\nu}, \tag{2.53}$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_\nu = \frac{L_\nu D_X^\nu}{\mu(1+\nu)}. \tag{2.54}$$

b) If, in addition, f is convex and stepsizes are chosen such that $\alpha_1 = 1$ and

$$\alpha_k \leq \frac{3}{4} \quad \forall k \geq 2, \tag{2.55}$$

then for any $N \geq 1$, we have

$$16A_N^{-1}[\Psi(y_N) - \Psi(u)] + \sum_{k=1}^N \mu\alpha_k A_k^{-1}\|g_{_{X,k}}\|^2 \leq 2\mu D_X^2 + (8\sqrt{\mu}\mathcal{C}_\nu)^2 \sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k^{1+2\nu} \quad \forall u \in X, \tag{2.56}$$

where A_k is defined in (2.10). If (2.55) holds for any $k \geq 1$, then the above relation is changed to

$$16A_N^{-1}[\Psi(y_N) - \Psi(u)] + \sum_{k=1}^N \mu\alpha_k A_k^{-1}\|g_{_{X,k}}\|^2 \leq 16[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi(u)] + (8\sqrt{\mu}\mathcal{C}_\nu)^2 \sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k^{1+2\nu} \quad \forall u \in X. \tag{2.57}$$

Proof. We first show part a). Noting (2.52), the fact that $\Psi(y_k) \leq \Psi(\tilde{y}_k)$, and similar to (2.16), we obtain

$$\Psi(y_k) \leq \Psi(\tilde{y}_k) \leq \Psi(y_{k-1}) - \frac{\beta_k(2-\beta_k)\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{L_\nu \beta_k^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu}. \tag{2.58}$$

Also by the fact that $ab \leq a^2/2 + b^2/2$, we have

$$\frac{L_\nu m_1^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} \leq \frac{(m_2 L_\nu)^2 m_1^{1+2\nu}}{2\mu(1+\nu)^2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{2\nu} + \frac{\mu m_1}{2m_2^2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 \tag{2.59}$$

for some $m_1 > 0$ and $m_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Combining the above relation with the choice of $m_1 = \beta_k$, $m_2 = 1$ and (2.58), we obtain

$$\Psi(y_k) \leq \Psi(y_{k-1}) - \frac{\beta_k(1-\beta_k)\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{L_\nu^2 \beta_k^{1+2\nu}}{2\mu(1+\nu)^2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{2\nu}.$$

Summing up the above inequalities, re-arranging the terms, noting the facts that $\Psi^* \leq \Psi(y_N)$, X is bounded, in the view of (2.3) and (2.54), we obtain (2.53).

We now show part b). Assume that f is convex. Noting the fact that $\Psi(y_k) \leq \Psi(\hat{y}_k)$ and (2.52), similar to (2.18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(y_k) &\leq \Psi(\hat{y}_k) \leq (1-\alpha_k)\Psi(y_{k-1}) + \alpha_k\Psi(u) - \frac{\alpha_k(1-\alpha_k)\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{L_\nu \alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{(1+\nu)}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} \\
&\leq (1-\alpha_k)\Psi(y_{k-1}) + \alpha_k\Psi(u) - \frac{\alpha_k(7-8\alpha_k)\mu}{16}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{4L_\nu^2\alpha_k^{1+2\nu}}{\mu(1+\nu)^2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{2\nu} \quad \forall u \in X,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (2.59) with the choice of $m_1 = \alpha_k$, $m_2 = \sqrt{8}$. Subtracting $\Psi(u)$ from both sides of the above inequality, diving them by A_k, noting (2.10) with the fact that $\alpha_1 = 1$, and (2.55), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mu\alpha_1}{16A_1}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{\Psi(y_1) - \Psi(u)}{A_1} &\leq \frac{\mu}{8}\|x_1 - y_0\|^2 + \frac{4L_\nu^2\alpha_1^{1+2\nu}}{\mu(1+\nu)^2 A_1}\|x_1 - y_0\|^{2\nu} \\
\frac{\mu\alpha_k}{16A_k}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{\Psi(y_k) - \Psi(u)}{A_k} &\leq \frac{\Psi(y_{k-1}) - \Psi(u)}{A_{k-1}} + \frac{4L_\nu^2\alpha_k^{1+2\nu}}{\mu(1+\nu)^2 A_k}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{2\nu} \quad \forall k \geq 2,
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up the above inequalities and noting that X is bounded, we clearly obtain (2.56). When $\alpha_1 \leq 3/4$ the second inequality in the above relation holds for any $k \geq 1$ and hence we can obtain (2.57) similarly.

■

In the nest result, we specify the choice of stepsizes β_k and α_k to specialize the convergence rate of Algorithm 3 when applied to nonconvex or strongly convex problems defined in (1.1).

Corollary 7 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 3 and X is bounded.*

a) If Ψ is bounded from below, the stepsizes are set to

$$\beta_k = \frac{1}{2N^q} \quad k = 1, 2, \ldots, N \tag{2.60}$$

for some $q \in (0, 1)$ and any $N \geq 1$, then we have

$$\min_{k=1,2,\ldots,N} \|g_{X,k}\|^2 \leq \frac{8[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*]}{\mu N^{1-q}} + \frac{2^{1-2\nu}\mathcal{C}_\nu^2}{N^{2q\nu}}, \tag{2.61}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_\nu$ is defined in (2.54).

b) If, in addition, f is convex, an optimal solution x^* exists for problem (1.1), and stepsizes are set

$$\alpha_k = \frac{3}{k+2} \quad \forall k \geq 1, \tag{2.62}$$

then for any $N \geq 1$, we have

$$\min_{k=1,2,\ldots,N} \|g_{X,k}\|^2 \leq \frac{12D_X^2}{N(N+1)(N+2)} + \left(\frac{4\sqrt{6}\cdot 3^{1+\nu}\mathcal{C}_\nu}{(N+2)^\nu}\right)^2, \tag{2.63}$$

$$\Psi(y_N) - \Psi(x^*) \leq \frac{3\mu D_X^2}{4N(N+1)(N+2)} + \left(\frac{3^{1+\nu}\sqrt{6\mu}\mathcal{C}_\nu}{(N+2)^\nu}\right)^2. \tag{2.64}$$

If $\alpha_1 = 3/4$ and (2.62) holds for $k \geq 2$, then the above bounds are changed to

$$\min_{k=1,2,\ldots,N} \|g_{X,k}\|^2 \leq \frac{96[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi(x^*)]}{\mu N(N+1)(N+2)} + \left(\frac{4\sqrt{6}\cdot 3^{1+\nu}\mathcal{C}_\nu}{(N+2)^\nu}\right)^2, \tag{2.65}$$

$$\Psi(y_N) - \Psi(x^*) \leq \frac{3[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi(x^*)]}{2N(N+1)(N+2)} + \left(\frac{3^{1+\nu}\sqrt{3\mu}\mathcal{C}_\nu}{\sqrt{2}(N+2)^\nu}\right)^2. \tag{2.66}$$

Proof. First, note that by (2.60), we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k(1-\beta_k) = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{2N^q}\left(1 - \frac{1}{2N^q}\right) \geq \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{4N^q} = \frac{N^{1-q}}{4},$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k^{1+2\nu} = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{(2N^q)^{1+2\nu}} = \frac{1}{2^{1+2\nu}N^{(q-1+2q\nu)}},$$

which together with (2.53) and $\min_{k=1,2,\ldots,N} \|g_{X,k}\|^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k(1-\beta_k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^N \beta_k(1-\beta_k)\|g_{X,k}\|^2$ imply (2.61).

Second, noting (2.62) and (2.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_k &= A_1\prod_{i=2}^{k}(1-\alpha_i)=\prod_{i=2}^{k}(1-\alpha_i)=\prod_{i=2}^{k}\frac{i-1}{i+2}=\frac{6}{k(k+1)(k+2)}, \qquad (2.67)\\ \sum_{k=1}^{N}\alpha_k A_k^{-1} &= \sum_{k=1}^{N}\frac{k(k+1)}{2}=\frac{N(N+1)(N+2)}{6}, \qquad (2.68)\\ \sum_{k=1}^{N}\alpha_k^{1+2\nu}A_k^{-1} &= \sum_{k=1}^{N}\frac{3^{2\nu}k(k+1)}{2(k+2)^{2\nu}}\le\frac{3^{2\nu}}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N}(k+1)^{2(1-\nu)}\le\frac{3^{2\nu}}{2}\int_1^{N+1}(x+1)^{2(1-\nu)}dx\\ &= \frac{3^{2\nu}[(N+2)^{3-2\nu}-2^{3-2\nu}]}{2(3-2\nu)}\le\frac{3^{2\nu}(N+2)^{3-2\nu}}{2}\le\frac{3^{2+2\nu}N(N+1)(N+2)^{1-2\nu}}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (2.56) and the fact that $\Psi(y_N)-\Psi(x^*)\ge 0$, imply (2.63) and (2.64). Similarly, we can obtain (2.65) and (2.66) and hence the details are skipped. ∎

We now add a few remarks about the above results. First, note that the convergence rate of Algorithm 3 when f is nonconvex depends on the choice of q. In particular, (2.61) implies that the number of iterations required by this method to have $\|g_{_{X,k}}\|^2\le\epsilon$ for at least one k, is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}(1)\left\{\left(\frac{\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*}{\mu\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}+\left(\frac{L_\nu D_X^\nu}{\mu\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q\nu}}\right\}. \qquad (2.69)$$

It can be easily seen that the best choice is $q=1/(1+2\nu)$ which reduces the above bound to

$$\mathcal{O}(1)\left\{[\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*]^{\frac{1+2\nu}{2\nu}}+[L_\nu D_X^\nu/\sqrt{\mu}]^{\frac{1+2\nu}{\nu}}\right\}\left(\frac{1}{\mu\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1+2\nu}{2\nu}}, \qquad (2.70)$$

which is slightly worse than the ones in (2.34) and (2.49). However, the bound in (2.69) is obtained without knowing any problem parameter or doing any line search procedure.

Second, for the sake of simplicity, let's consider the convergence of Algorithm 3 when $\alpha_1=3/4$ and f is convex. Hence, (2.65) implies that to have $\|g_{_{X,k}}\|^2\le\epsilon$ for at least one k, the iteration complexity of Algorithm 3 is bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}(1)\left\{\left(\frac{\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*}{\mu\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}+\left(\frac{L_\nu D_X^\nu}{\mu\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\nu}}\right\}, \qquad (2.71)$$

which is slightly worse than the ones in (2.35) and (2.50). Moreover, this bound guarantees finding a solution $\bar{x}$ such that $\Psi(\bar{x})-\Psi(x^*)\le\mu\epsilon$. The above bound (disregarding the first term) is also obtained by Nesterov in [28] for Algorithm 1 when f is convex. However, our choice of stepsizes and analysis in the MCGT method as a variant of Algorithm 1 is slightly different.

Finally, note that although the bounds in (2.69) and (2.71) are worse than their corresponding ones we obtained for nonconvex and strongly convex problems, respectively, they obtained without requiring any information about all problem parameters. Hence, Algorithm 3 is totally independent of such parameters and is easily implementable. On the other hand, if we know the problem parameters, it is possible to modify Algorithm 3 and obtain better results. In particular, motivated by [8, 20], we can properly shrink the feasible set and restart Algorithm 3 to improve its convergence rate. Below, we describe this modified variant of Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 4 The shrinking multi-stage conditional gradient type (SMCGT) algorithm

Input: $w_0 \in X$, $d_0 = D_X$, $t = 0$, and $\tilde{x}_0 = \tilde{y}_0 = w_0$.

For $s = 1, 2, \ldots$**:**

Set $x_0 = w_{s-1}$ and

$$N_s = \left\lceil \max \left\{ \sqrt[3]{6}, 6 \left[\frac{12\sqrt{3} L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu d_{s-1}^{(1-\nu)}} \right]^{\frac{1}{\nu}} \right\} \right\rceil. \tag{2.72}$$

For $k = 1, 2, \ldots, N_s$**:**

0. Set the initial points $y_0 = x_0$.
1. Compute $f'(y_{k-1})$ and set

$$x_k = \arg \min_{u \in X_{s-1}} \{ \langle f'(y_{k-1}), u \rangle + h(u) \}, \tag{2.73}$$

where

$$X_{s-1} = \{ u \in X \quad : \|u - w_{s-1}\| \leq d_{s-1} \}. \tag{2.74}$$

2. Choose α_k according to (2.62) and set y_k to (2.2).
3. Compute $f'(\tilde{y}_{t-1})$ and set $t = t + 1$, $\tilde{x}_t = \arg\min_{u \in X} \{ \langle f'(\tilde{y}_{t-1}), u \rangle + h(u) \}$. Choose $\tilde{y}_t$ such that $\Psi(\tilde{y}_t) = \min\{\Psi(y_k), \Psi((1-\beta_t)\tilde{y}_{t-1} + \beta_t \tilde{x}_t)\}$, where β_t is set to (2.60).

End

Set $w_s = y_{N_s}$ and $d_s = d_{s-1}/\sqrt{2}$.

End

We now add a few remarks about the above algorithm. First, note that three indices are used in the above algorithm. The first one, s, controls the number of stages in which we reset the stepsize α_k. The second one, k, shows the iterations of the inner FCGT method in each stage. The last one, t, keeps the track of all generated solutions by the inner FCGT method without re-starting in the sequence $\{\tilde{x}_t, \tilde{y}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$. Indeed, using this index, we can define the gradient mapping as $\tilde{g}_{X,t} = \tilde{y}_{t-1} - \tilde{x}_t$ which is similar to (2.3). It should be also mentioned that this inner FCGT method is slightly different than Algorithm 3 in updating y_k and $\tilde{y}_t$.

Second, note that in each stage Algorithm 4, the subproblems are defined over the intersection of the original feasible set X and a ball centered at the output of the previous stage. This can make the subproblems in (2.73) harder to solve. On the other hand, as we will see in the rest of this section, this kind of shrinking the feasible set allows us to improve the convergence rate of the FCGT method to that of the CGT method when the problem is strongly convex. Note however, that to obtain this improvement, unlike the FCGT method, we need to know the problem parameters. Moreover, we need to solve one extra subproblem in step 3 of each stage of Algorithm 4 to recover the convergence rate of the FCGT method if the problems is possibly nonconvex. In this step, we need to specify the value of N. We address this issue after presenting the next result showing the convergence properties of Algorithm 4.

Corollary 8 *Suppose that the sequence $\{w_s\}_{s \geq 0}$ is generated by the shrinking multi-stage CGT method.*

a) For any $N \geq 1$, (2.61) holds where $\min_{k=1,\ldots,N} \|g_{X,k}\|^2$ is replaced by $\min_{t=1,\ldots,N} \|\tilde{g}_{X,t}\|^2$.

b) If, in addition, f is convex and an optimal solution x^* exists for problem (1.1), then for any $s \geq 1$, we have

$$\min_{k=1,2,\ldots,N_s} \|g_{X,k}\|^2 \quad \leq \quad \frac{20 D_X^2}{2^s} \tag{2.75}$$

$$\Psi(w_s) - \Psi(x^*) \quad \leq \quad \frac{\mu D_X^2}{2^{s+1}}. \tag{2.76}$$

Proof. First, note that part a) follows from the proof of Corollary 7.a) with replacing index k and the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ by t and $\{\tilde{x}_t, \tilde{y}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$, respectively. Second, assume that f is convex. we show by induction that the shrinking procedure preserve the optimal solution x^*. For $s = 1$, this is clearly true due to the fact that $\|x^* - w_0\| \leq d_0 = D_X$. Assuming that $x^* \in X_{s-1}$, we conclude that (2.64) holds in stage s with replacing D_X by $D_{X_{s-1}} := \max_{x,y\in X_{s-1}} \|x - y\| \leq \|x - w_{s-1}\| + \|y - w_{s-1}\| \leq 2d_{s-1}$ in (2.54) i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(w_s) - \Psi(x^*) &\leq \frac{3\mu d_{s-1}^2}{4N_s(N_s+1)(N_s+2)} + \left(\frac{3\sqrt{6}\cdot 6^\nu L_\nu d_{s-1}^\nu}{\sqrt{\mu}(1+\nu)(N_s+2)^\nu}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{3\mu d_{s-1}^2}{4N_s^3} + \left(\frac{3\sqrt{6}\cdot 6^\nu L_\nu d_{s-1}^\nu}{\sqrt{\mu}(1+\nu)N_s^\nu}\right)^2 \leq \frac{\mu d_{s-1}^2}{4}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.77}$$

where the last inequality follows from (2.72). Noting the above inequality and strong convexity of Ψ due to convexity of f , we have

$$\|x^* - w_s\|^2 \leq \frac{2[\Psi(w_s) - \Psi(x^*)]}{\mu} \leq \frac{d_{s-1}^2}{2} = d_s^2,$$

which implies that $x^* \in X_s$. Therefore, (2.77) holds for any stage $s \geq 1$ which together with the fact that $d_s^2 = 2^{-s} d_0^2$, imply (2.76). Moreover, since the shrinking procedure does not discard the optimal solution, the gradient mapping defined in (2.3) is well-defined for each stage. Hence, (2.75) follows similarly from (2.63) and (2.72). ∎

Observe that (2.75) implies that to find an ϵ-stationary point of problem (1.1) when f is convex (Ψ is strongly convex), the number of stages S should be set to $\log(20D_X^2/\epsilon)$. This observation and (2.72) imply that the total number of iterations performed by Algorithm 4 is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{s=1}^S N_s &\leq \sum_{s=1}^S \left\{1 + \sqrt[3]{6} + 6\left[\frac{12\sqrt{3}L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu d_{s-1}^{(1-\nu)}}\right]^{\frac{1}{\nu}}\right\} \leq 3S + 6\left[\frac{12\sqrt{3}L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu D_X^{1-\nu}}\right]^{\frac{1}{\nu}} \sum_{s=1}^S 2^{\frac{(1-\nu)(s-1)}{2\nu}} \\ &= 3S + 6\left[\frac{12\sqrt{3}L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu D_X^{1-\nu}}\right]^{\frac{1}{\nu}} \left[\frac{2^{\frac{(1-\nu)S}{2\nu}} - 1}{2^{\frac{1-\nu}{2\nu}} - 1}\right] \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\left[\log\left(\frac{D_X^2}{\epsilon}\right) + \left(\frac{L_\nu^2}{\mu^2\epsilon^{1-\nu}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2\nu}}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.78}$$

This bound also guarantees $\Psi(\bar{x}) - \Psi(x^*) \leq \mu\epsilon$ for $\bar{x} \in X$ due to (2.76). This bound is much better than (2.71). However, as mentioned before, it requires knowing the problem parameters. Also it is better than (2.35) and (2.50) up to a logarithmic constant.

On the other hand, Corollary 8. a) implies that the complexity of Algorithm 4 for finding an ϵ-approximate solution of problem (1.1) is bounded by (2.69) when f is possibly nonconvex. Since this bound is larger than (2.78) and we assume that the problem parameters are known in this algorithm, the values of q and N in Step 3 of each stage can be set $1/(1 + 2\nu)$ to (2.70), respectively. In this case, the number of stages will be also larger than $\log(20D_X^2/\epsilon)$.

3 Stochastic Conditional gradient type method for composite optimization

In this section, we would like to generalize the algorithms presented in Section 2 for solving problem (1.1) under stochastic setting. In particular, we assume that only noisy information of f is available through the stochastic oracle ($\mathcal{SO}$) satisfying Assumption 1. Moreover, we consider $\|\cdot\|$ as the norm associated with inner product in $\mathbb{R}^n$ throughout this section.

Below, we present a stochastic conditional gradient type (SCGT) algorithm.

Algorithm 5 The randomized stochastic conditional gradient type (RSCGT) algorithm

Input: $x_0 \in X$, $\{\alpha_k\}_{k\geq 1} \in (0,1]$, an iteration limit $N \geq 1$, probability mass function (PMF) $P_R(\cdot)$ supported on $\{1,2,\ldots,N\}$, and sequence of positive integer numbers $\{b_k\}_{k\geq 1}$.

0. Set $y_0 = x_0$, $k = 1$, and generate random variable R according to $P_R(\cdot)$.

For $k = 1, 2, \ldots, R$**:**

1. Call the stochastic oracle b_k times to compute

$$\bar{G}(y_{k-1}, \xi_k) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{b_k} G(y_{k-1}, \xi_{i,k})}{b_k}. \tag{3.1}$$

2. Set

$$x_k = \arg\min_{u\in X} \left\{ \langle \bar{G}(y_{k-1}, \xi_k), u\rangle + h(u) \right\} \tag{3.2}$$

and y_k to (2.2).

End

Note that the above algorithm differs from Algorithm 1 in two aspects. First, replacing the true gradient of f by its stochastic approximation given in (3.1). While this average of stochastic gradients is an unbiased estimator for the true gradient of f, it has reduced variance with respect to the individual ones. More specially, denoting $\Delta_{i,k} = G(y_{k-1}, \xi_{i,k}) - f'(y_{k-1})$ and under Assumption 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\bar{G}(y_{k-1}, \xi_k)] &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{b_k} \mathbb{E}[G(y_{k-1}, \xi_{i,k})]}{b_k} = f'(y_{k-1}), \\ \mathbb{E}\left[\|\bar{G}(y_{k-1}, \xi_k) - f'(y_{k-1})\|_*^2\right] &= \frac{1}{b_k^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\|\sum_{i=1}^{b_k} \Delta_{i,k}\|_*^2\right] \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{b_k}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\mathbb{E}\left[\langle \sum_{i=1}^{b_k-1} \Delta_{i,k}, \Delta_{b_k,k}\rangle | \sum_{i=1}^{b_k-1} \Delta_{i,k}\right] = 0$.

Second, Algorithm 1 is terminated according to the random variable R. Hence, this algorithm consists of two levels of randomness: ξ coming from the stochastic oracle and R imposed for terminating the algorithm. This randomization scheme is the current practice for establishing convergence rate of stochastic algorithms for nonconvex problems. As mentioned in Section 1, it was first proposed by Ghadimi and Lan in [9] and for smooth unconstrained stochastic optimization and later used for constrained and composite optimization (see e.g., [11, 10, 3]).

Noting subproblem (3.2), we can define stochastic gradient mapping similar to its deterministic counterpart. The following simple technical result shows the relation between these two gradient mappings in expectation.

Lemma 9 *Let $g_{X,k}$ be defined by (2.3) and $\bar{g}_{X,k}$ be the stochastic gradient mapping given by $\bar{g}_{X,k} = y_{k-1} - \bar{x}_k$, where $\bar{x}_k = x_k$ and x_k is computed according to (3.2). Then, under Assumption 1, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|g_{X,k} - \bar{g}_{X,k}\|^2\right] \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu^2 b_k}.$$

Proof. By the optimality condition of (3.2), we have

$$\langle f'(y_{k-1}) + \bar{p}_h, x - \bar{x}_k\rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in X,$$

where $\bar{p}_h \in \partial h(\bar{x}_k)$. Letting $x = x_k$ in the above relation, $u = \bar{x}_k$ in (2.4), and adding them up, we obtain

$$\langle f'(y_{k-1}) - \bar{G}(y_{k-1}, \xi_k) + p_h - \bar{p}_h, \bar{x}_k - x_k\rangle \geq 0,$$

which together with the strong convexity of h and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality imply that

$$\|f'(y_{k-1}) - \bar{G}(y_{k-1},\xi_k)\|_*\|\bar{x}_k - x_k\| \geq \langle f'(y_{k-1}) - \bar{G}(y_{k-1},\xi_k), \bar{x}_k - x_k\rangle \geq \langle p_h - \bar{p}_h, x_k - \bar{x}_k\rangle \geq \mu\|x_k - \bar{x}_k\|^2.$$

Hence, noting (3.3) under Assumption 1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|g_{X,k} - \bar{g}_{X,k}\|^2\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\|x_k - \bar{x}_k\|^2\right] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\|f'(y_{k-1}) - \bar{G}(y_{k-1},\xi_k)\|_*^2\right]}{\mu^2} \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu^2 b_k}.$$

■

Using the above results, we can establish the convergence results of Algorithm 5. Note that we cannot generalize the analysis used in Theorem 2 to the weakly smooth stochastic problems due to the dependence of the stepsizes on the stochastic gradient mapping. However, when $\nu = 1$, there is no such a dependence. Hence, we only generalize the convergence analysis used in Theorem 2 to the stochastic setting of Algorithm 5 when f in (1.1) is smooth.

Theorem 10 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 5 and f in (1.1) has Lipschitz continuous gradient i.e., $\nu = 1$ in (1.3) and (1.4). Moreover, assume that the stepsizes satisfy*

$$\alpha_k < \frac{\mu}{2(L_1 + \mu)} \quad \forall k \geq 1. \tag{3.4}$$

a) Let R be a discrete random variable whose PMF given by

$$P_R(R = k) = \frac{\alpha_k[3\mu - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k]}{\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k[3\mu - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k]} \quad k = 1, \ldots, N \tag{3.5}$$

for some given iteration limit $N \geq 1$. If Ψ is bounded from below, then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \frac{8[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*] + \frac{2\sigma^2}{\mu}\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k b_k^{-1}(5 - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k/\mu)}{\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k[3\mu - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k]}. \tag{3.6}$$

b) If f is convex, an optimal solution x^* exits for problem (1.1), and $P_R(\cdot)$ is given by

$$P_R(R = k) = \frac{A_k^{-1}\alpha_k[\mu - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k]}{\sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k[\mu - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k]} \quad k = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{3.7}$$

where A_k is defined in (2.10), then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \frac{8\bar{\Psi}_0(x^*) + \frac{2\sigma^2}{\mu}\sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k b_k^{-1}(5 - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k/\mu)}{\sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k[\mu - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k]}, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}[\bar{\Psi}_R(x^*)] \leq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k[\mu - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k]\left(\bar{\Psi}_0(x^*) + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu}\sum_{i=1}^k A_i^{-1}\alpha_i b_i^{-1}\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k[\mu - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k]}, \tag{3.9}$$

where $\bar{\Psi}_k(u)$ is defined in (2.9).

Proof. We first show part a). Denoting $\Delta_k = \bar{G}(y_{k-1},\xi_k) - f'(y_{k-1})$, noting (3.2), and similar to (2.5), we have

$$\langle f'(y_{k-1}) + \Delta_k, x_k - u\rangle + h(x_k) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|x_k - u\|^2 \leq h(u) \quad \forall u \in X. \tag{3.10}$$

Hence, letting $u = y_{k-1}$ in the above relation and similar to (2.16) (with $\nu = 1$), we obtain

$$\Psi(y_k) \leq \Psi(y_{k-1}) - \frac{\alpha_k[(2 - \alpha_k)\mu - L_1\alpha_k]}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \alpha_k\langle\Delta_k, y_{k-1} - x_k\rangle,$$

which together with

$$\alpha_k\langle\Delta_k, y_{k-1}-x_k\rangle \leq \alpha_k\|x_k-y_{k-1}\|\|\Delta_k\|_* \leq \frac{\mu\alpha_k\|x_k-y_{k-1}\|^2}{2m_3^2}+\frac{m_3^2\alpha_k\|\Delta_k\|_*^2}{2\mu} \tag{3.11}$$

(with $m_3=\sqrt{2}$), imply that

$$\Psi(y_k)\leq \Psi(y_{k-1})-\frac{\alpha_k[3\mu-2(\mu+L_1)\alpha_k]}{4}\|x_k-y_{k-1}\|^2+\frac{\alpha_k\|\Delta_k\|_*^2}{\mu} \tag{3.12}$$

Summing up the above inequalities, noting that $\Psi(y_N)\geq\Psi^*$, and re-arranging the terms, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^N\left(\frac{\alpha_k[3\mu-2(\mu+L_1)\alpha_k]}{4}\|x_k-y_{k-1}\|^2\right)\leq \Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*+\frac{\sum_{k=1}^N\alpha_k\|\Delta_k\|_*^2}{\mu}.$$

Taking the expectation from both sides of the above inequality , noting (3.3), and in the view of definition of $\bar{g}_{_{X,k}}$ in Lemma 9, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^N\left(\frac{\alpha_k[3\mu-2(\mu+L_1)\alpha_k]}{4}\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]}}\left[\|\tilde{g}_{_{X,k}}\|^2\right]\right)\leq \Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*+\frac{\sigma^2}{\mu}\sum_{k=1}^N\alpha_k b_k^{-1}.$$

Noting (3.4), dividing both sides by $\sum_{k=1}^N\alpha_k[3\mu-2(\mu+L_1)\alpha_k]/4$, and noting that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|\bar{g}_{_{X,R}}\|^2\right]=\frac{\sum_{k=1}^N\left(\alpha_k[3\mu-2(\mu+L_1)\alpha_k]\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]}}\left[\|\bar{g}_{_{X,k}}\|^2\right]\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^N\alpha_k[3\mu-2(\mu+L_1)\alpha_k]}$$

due to (3.5), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|\bar{g}_{_{X,k}}\|^2\right]\leq\frac{4[\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*+\mu^{-1}\sigma^2\sum_{k=1}^N\alpha_k b_k^{-1}]}{\sum_{k=1}^N\alpha_k[3\mu-2(\mu+L_1)\alpha_k]},$$

which together with

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{_{X,R}}\|^2\right]\leq 2\left(\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|\bar{g}_{_{X,R}}\|^2\right]+\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{_{X,R}}-\bar{g}_{_{X,R}}\|^2\right]\right)$$

and in the view of Lemma 9, clearly implies (3.6).

We now show part b). Noting (3.10), (3.11) (with $m_3=\sqrt{2}$), and similar to (2.18) (with $\nu=1$), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Psi(y_k)+\frac{\mu}{2}\|y_k-u\|^2\\
&\leq(1-\alpha_k)\left[\Psi(y_{k-1})+\frac{\mu}{2}\|y_{k-1}-u\|^2\right]+\alpha_k\Psi(u)-\frac{\alpha_k[(1-\alpha_k)\mu-L_1\alpha_k]}{2}\|x_k-y_{k-1}\|^2+\alpha_k\langle\Delta_k,u-x_k\rangle\\
&\leq(1-\alpha_k)\left[\Psi(y_{k-1})+\frac{\mu}{2}\|y_{k-1}-u\|^2\right]+\alpha_k\Psi(u)-\frac{\alpha_k[\mu-2(\mu+L_1)\alpha_k]}{4}\|x_k-y_{k-1}\|^2+\frac{\alpha_k\|\Delta_k\|_*^2}{\mu}\\
&\qquad\qquad+\alpha_k\langle\Delta_k,u-y_{k-1}\rangle\ \ \forall u\in X.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.13}$$

Subtracting $\Psi(u)$ from both sides of the above inequality, diving them by A_k, noting (2.10), and summing them up, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\bar{\Psi}_N(u)}{A_N}\leq\bar{\Psi}_0(u)-\sum_{k=1}^N\frac{\alpha_k[\mu-2(\mu+L_1)\alpha_k]}{4A_k}\|x_k-y_{k-1}\|^2 &+ \sum_{k=1}^N\frac{\alpha_k\|\Delta_k\|_*^2}{\mu A_k}\\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^N\frac{\alpha_k}{A_k}\langle\Delta_k,u-y_{k-1}\rangle\ \ \forall u\in X.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation from both sides of the above relation, noting (3.3), the fact that y_{k-1} only depends on $\xi_{[k-1]}$ and hence $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[k]}}[\langle \Delta_k, u - y_{k-1}\rangle | \xi_{[k-1]}] = 0$ under Assumption 1, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]}}[\bar{\Psi}_N(u)]}{A_N} \leq \bar{\Psi}_0(u) - \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{\alpha_k[\mu - 2(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k]}{4A_k} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]}}\left[\|\bar{g}_{X,R}\|^2\right] + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\frac{\alpha_k}{A_k b_k} \quad \forall u \in X.$$

Letting $u = x^*$ in the above relation, noting the fact that $\bar{\Psi}_N(x^*) \geq 0$, and following the similar ideas to part a), we obtain (3.8) and (3.9). ∎

In the next result, we specialize the convergence rate of Algorithm 5 by specifying the choice of stepsizes.

Corollary 11 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 5 and f in (1.1) has Lipschitz continuous gradient. Moreover, assume that the stepsizes and batch sizes are set to*

$$\alpha_k = \bar{\alpha} = \frac{\mu}{4(L_1 + \mu)} \quad \text{and} \quad b_k = b \quad \forall k \geq 1 \tag{3.14}$$

for some positive integer b.

a) Let R be a discrete random variable uniformly distributed over $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ for some given iteration limit $N \geq 1$. If Ψ is bounded from below, then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \frac{64(\mu + L_1)[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*]}{5\mu^2 N} + \frac{18\sigma^2}{5\mu^2 b}. \tag{3.15}$$

b) If f is convex, an optimal solution x^* exits for problem (1.1), and $P_R(\cdot)$ is given by

$$P_R(R = k) = \frac{\bar{\alpha}(1 - \bar{\alpha})^{N-k}}{1 - (1 - \bar{\alpha})^N} \quad k = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{3.16}$$

then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \frac{64(\mu + L_1)}{\mu^2}\left(1 - \frac{\mu}{4(L_1 + \mu)}\right)^N \bar{\Psi}_0(x^*) + \frac{18\sigma^2}{\mu^2 b}, \tag{3.17}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}[\bar{\Psi}_R(x^*)] \leq N\left(1 - \frac{\mu}{4(L_1 + \mu)}\right)^N \bar{\Psi}_0(x^*) + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu b}, \tag{3.18}$$

where $\bar{\Psi}_k(u)$ is defined in (2.9).

Proof. First, observe that the choice of α_k in (3.14) satisfies (3.4) and we have $(\mu + L_1)\alpha_k = \mu/4$ and $\alpha_k[\mu - (\mu + L_1)\alpha_k] = 3\mu^2/[16(\mu + L_1)]$, which together with (3.5) imply that $P_R(R = k) = 1/N$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. Noting this observation, the fact that the batch sizes are fixed, and (3.6), we clearly obtain (3.15).

Second, noting (2.10) and similar to (2.48), we have

$$A_k = (1 - \bar{\alpha})^k \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\alpha}A_N^{-1} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{N} A_k^{-1}\alpha_k = A_N^{-1} - 1 \leq A_N^{-1},$$

which together with (3.7), (3.8), and (3.9) clearly imply (3.16), (3.17), and (3.18), respectively. ∎

Note that all of the bounds in the above result depend on the choice of batch size b. Hence, if it is not large enough, we cannot provide the convergence rate for Algorithm 5. On the other hand, if it is too large, each iteration of this algorithm will be more expensive in terms of number of calls to the $\mathcal{SO}$. In the next result, we show the appropriate choice of this batch size which balances the iteration cost and number of iterations in Algorithm 5.

Corollary 12 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 5 and f is (1.1) has Lipschitz continuous gradient. Moreover, assume that the stepsizes are set to (3.14) and batch sizes are set to*

$$b_k = b_\epsilon = \left\lceil \frac{20\sigma^2}{\mu^2 \epsilon} \right\rceil \quad \forall k \geq 1 \tag{3.19}$$

for a given accuracy $\epsilon > 0$.

a) If the iteration limit is set to

$$N = N_1(\epsilon) = \left\lceil \frac{16(\mu + L_1)D_0}{\mu^2 \epsilon} \right\rceil \tag{3.20}$$

for some $D_0 \geq \Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*$, then the total required number of calls to the stochastic oracle to have $\mathbb{E}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \epsilon$ is bounded by

$$b_\epsilon N_1(\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(1)\left(\frac{(\mu + L_1)\sigma^2[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*]}{\mu^4 \epsilon^2}\right), \tag{3.21}$$

where R is uniformly distributed over $\{1, 2, \ldots, N_1(\epsilon)\}$.

b) If f is convex, an optimal solution x^* exits for problem (1.1), and the iteration limit is set to

$$N = N_2(\epsilon) = \left\lceil \frac{4(\mu + L_1)}{\mu} \ln\left(\frac{1280(\mu + L_1)D_0}{\mu^2 \epsilon}\right) \right\rceil, \tag{3.22}$$

then the complexity bound in (3.21) is improved to

$$b_\epsilon N_2(\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(1)\left(\frac{(\mu + L_1)\sigma^2}{\mu^3 \epsilon} \ln\left[\frac{(\mu + L_1)[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi(x^*)]}{\mu^2 \epsilon}\right]\right), \tag{3.23}$$

where the PMF of R over $\{1, 2, \ldots, N_2(\epsilon)\}$ is given by (3.16). Moreover, the above bound guarantees $\mathbb{E}\left[\Psi(y_R) - \Psi(x^*)\right] \leq \mu\epsilon$.

Proof. First, observe that by (3.15), (3.19), and (3.20) we clearly have $\mathbb{E}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \epsilon$. In this case, the total number of calls to the $\mathcal{SO}$ is bounded by $\sum_{k=1}^{N} b_k = \sum_{k=1}^{N_1(\epsilon)} b_\epsilon = N_1(\epsilon) b_\epsilon$ which implies (3.21).

Second, if f is convex, (3.17), (3.19), (3.22), and the fact that $(1+x)^N \leq e^{-xN}$ imply that $\mathbb{E}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \epsilon$. Moreover, (3.18), (3.19), and (3.22) clearly imply $\mathbb{E}\left[\Psi(y_R) - \Psi(x^*)\right] \leq \mu\epsilon$. Hence, the total number of calls to the $\mathcal{SO}$ is bounded by $N_2(\epsilon) b_\epsilon$ which implies (3.23). ∎

Note that, disregarding μ, the bound in (3.21) is the best known complexity of first-order methods when applied to smooth nonconvex stochastic optimization (see e.g., [9, 11, 10]). Moreover, the complexity bound in (3.23) is optimal up to a logarithmic constant for solving smooth strongly convex stochastic optimization [23]. However, the expectation here is taken with respect to an extra random variable R.

In the rest of this section, we present a different analysis and choice of stepsizes for Algorithm 5 which allow us to establish some convergence results when f in (1.1) is possibly weakly smooth.

Theorem 13 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 5 and X is bounded.*

a) Let R be a discrete random variable whose PMR given by

$$P_R(R = k) = \frac{\alpha_k(1 - \alpha_k)}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \alpha_k(1 - \alpha_k)} \quad k = 1, \ldots, N \tag{3.24}$$

for some iteration limit $N \geq 1$. If Ψ is bounded from below, then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \frac{4[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*] + 4\mu\mathcal{C}_\nu^2 \sum_{k=1}^{N} \alpha_k^{1+2\nu} + 2\sigma^2/\mu \sum_{k=1}^{N} \alpha_k b_k^{-1}[3 - \alpha_k]}{\mu \sum_{k=1}^{N} \alpha_k(1 - \alpha_k)}. \tag{3.25}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_\nu$ is defined in (2.54).

b) If f is convex, an optimal solution x^* exists for problem (1.1), the stepsizes satisfy

$$\alpha_1 = 1, \quad \alpha_k \leq \frac{3}{4} \quad \forall k \geq 2, \tag{3.26}$$

and $P_R(\cdot)$ is given by

$$P_R(R = k) = \frac{\alpha_k A_N}{A_k} \quad k = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{3.27}$$

where A_k is defined in (2.10), then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \frac{4D_X^2 + (8\sqrt{10}\mathcal{C}_\nu)^2 \sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k^{1+2\nu} + (\sqrt{182}\sigma/\mu)^2 \sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k b_k^{-1}}{\sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k}, \tag{3.28}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}[\Psi(y_R) - \Psi(x^*)] \leq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k \left(\mu D_X^2/16 + (2\sqrt{5\mu}\mathcal{C}_\nu)^2 \sum_{i=1}^k A_i^{-1}\alpha_i^{1+2\nu} + \frac{5\sigma^2}{\mu}\sum_{i=1}^k A_i^{-1}\alpha_i b_i^{-1}\right)}{\sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k}. \tag{3.29}$$

Proof. We first show part a). Noting (3.10) and similar to (2.16), we obtain

$$\Psi(y_k) \leq \Psi(y_{k-1}) - \frac{\alpha_k(2-\alpha_k)\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{L_\nu \alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} + \alpha_k\langle \Delta_k, y_{k-1} - x_k\rangle,$$

which together with (3.11) ($m_3 = \sqrt{2}$), (2.59) ($m_1 = \alpha_k$, $m_2 = \sqrt{2}$), and boundedness of X imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(y_k) &\leq \Psi(y_{k-1}) - \frac{\alpha_k(1-\alpha_k)\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \frac{L_\nu^2 \alpha_k^{1+2\nu}}{\mu(1+\nu)^2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{2\nu} + \frac{\alpha_k\|\Delta_k\|_*^2}{\mu} \\
&\leq \Psi(y_{k-1}) - \frac{\alpha_k(1-\alpha_k)\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 + \mu\mathcal{C}_\nu^2\alpha_k^{1+2\nu} + \frac{\alpha_k\|\Delta_k\|_*^2}{\mu},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_\nu$ is defined in (2.54). Rest of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 10.a) and hence we skip the details.

To show part b), assume that f is convex. Similar to (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(y_k) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|y_k - u\|^2 &\leq (1-\alpha_k)\left[\Psi(y_{k-1}) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|y_{k-1} - u\|^2\right] + \alpha_k\Psi(u) - \frac{\alpha_k(1-\alpha_k)\mu}{2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 \\
&+ \frac{L_\nu\alpha_k^{1+\nu}}{1+\nu}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{1+\nu} + \alpha_k\langle\Delta_k, u - x_k\rangle \\
&\leq (1-\alpha_k)\left[\Psi(y_{k-1}) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|y_{k-1} - u\|^2\right] + \alpha_k\Psi(u) - \frac{\alpha_k(7-8\alpha_k)\mu}{16}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^2 \\
&+ \frac{20L_\nu^2\alpha_k^{1+2\nu}}{\mu(1+\nu)^2}\|x_k - y_{k-1}\|^{2\nu} + \frac{5\alpha_k\|\Delta_k\|_*^2}{\mu} + \alpha_k\langle\Delta_k, u - y_{k-1}\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from (3.11) ($m_3 = \sqrt{10}$) and (2.59) ($m_1 = \alpha_k$, $m_2 = \sqrt{40}$). Noting that X is bounded, $\alpha_k(7 - 8\alpha_k) \geq \alpha_k \ \ \forall k \geq 2$ due to (3.26) and $\sum_{k=1}^N A_k^{-1}\alpha_k = A_N^{-1}$ due to fact that $\alpha_1 = 1$ and (2.48), rest of the proof follows similarly to those of Theorem 6.b) and Theorem 10.b). Hence we skip the details. ∎

In the next result, we specify two different stepsize policies for Algorithm 5 which do not depend on any problem parameter.

Corollary 14 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k, y_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 5, an iteration limit $N \geq 2$ is given, the feasible set X is bounded, and batch sizes are set to $b_k = b \ \ \forall k \geq 1$.*

a) If stepsizes are set to

$$\alpha_1 = 1, \quad \alpha_k = \frac{3}{4N^q} \quad \forall k = 2, 3, \ldots, N \tag{3.31}$$

for some $q \in (0,1)$, then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \frac{128[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^* + \mu\mathcal{C}_\nu^2]}{3\mu N^{1-q}} + \frac{16\mathcal{C}_\nu^2}{N^{2q\nu}} + \frac{88\sigma^2}{\mu^2 b}, \tag{3.32}$$

where $P_R(\cdot)$ is given by (3.24) and $\mathcal{C}_\nu$ is defined in (2.54).
If the stepsizes are set to (2.62), then the above bound is changed to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \frac{16[\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*]}{\mu \ln N} + \frac{24(3/2)^{2\nu}\mathcal{C}_\nu^2}{\nu \ln N} + \frac{36\sigma^2}{\mu^2 b}. \tag{3.33}$$

b) If f is convex, an optimal solution x^* exists for problem (1.1), and stepsizes are set to (3.31), then we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq 4(D_X^2 + 160\mathcal{C}_\nu^2)\left(1 - \frac{3}{4N^q}\right)^{N-1} + \left(\frac{8\sqrt{10}\cdot 3^\nu \mathcal{C}_\nu}{4^\nu N^{q\nu}}\right)^2 + \frac{182\sigma^2}{\mu^2 b}, \tag{3.34}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}[\Psi(y_R) - \Psi(x^*)] \leq \frac{7\mu N^{1-q}(D_X^2/16 + 20\mathcal{C}_\nu^2)}{4}\left(1 - \frac{3}{4N^q}\right)^{N-1} + \left(\frac{3^\nu\sqrt{20\mu}\mathcal{C}_\nu}{4^\nu N^{q\nu}}\right)^2 + \frac{5\sigma^2}{\mu b}, \tag{3.35}$$

where $P_R(\cdot)$ is given by (3.27).
If the stepsizes are set to (2.62), then the above bounds are reduced to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right] \leq \frac{24D_X^2}{N(N+1)(N+2)} + \left(\frac{8\sqrt{15}\cdot 3^{1+\nu}\mathcal{C}_\nu}{(N+2)^\nu}\right)^2 + \frac{182\sigma^2}{\mu^2 b}, \tag{3.36}$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_{[N]},R}[\Psi(y_R) - \Psi(x^*)] \leq \frac{9\mu D_X^2 \ln N}{16N(N+1)(N+2)} + \left(\frac{8\sqrt{5\mu}\cdot 3^{1+\nu}\mathcal{C}_\nu}{(N+2)^\nu}\right)^2 + \frac{5\sigma^2}{\mu b}. \tag{3.37}$$

Proof. First, noting (3.31) and the assumption that batch sizes are fixed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k(1-\alpha_k) &= \sum_{k=2}^N \frac{3}{4N^q}\left(1 - \frac{3}{4N^q}\right) \geq \frac{3(N-1)}{16N^q} \geq \frac{3N^{1-q}}{32}, \\
\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k^{1+2\nu} &= 1 + \frac{3(N-1)}{4N^{q(1+2\nu)}}, \\
\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k b_k^{-1}[3-\alpha_k] &\leq 3\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k b_k^{-1} = \frac{3}{b}\left(1 + \frac{3(N-1)}{4N^q}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

which together with (3.25) imply (3.32). Also (3.33) follows by noting that (2.62) imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k &= \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{3}{k+2} \geq 3\int_1^{N+1} \frac{dx}{x+2} = 3\ln(1+N/3) \geq \frac{3}{2}\ln N, \\
\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k(1-\alpha_k) &= \sum_{k=2}^N \frac{3(k-1)}{(k+2)^2} \geq \sum_{k=2}^N \frac{3}{4(k+2)} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k - 1}{4} \geq \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k}{6}, \\
\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k^{1+2\nu} &= 3^{1+2\nu}\sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{(k+2)^{1+2\nu}} \leq 3^{1+2\nu}\int_0^N \frac{dx}{(x+2)^{1+2\nu}} \leq \frac{1}{\nu}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{1+2\nu}.
\end{aligned}$$

Second, by (3.31), (2.10), and (2.48), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\alpha_k &= 1-\frac{3}{4N^q}+\frac{3N^{1-q}}{4}\leq\frac{7N^{1-q}}{4}\\ \sum_{k=1}^{N}A_k^{-1}\alpha_k &= A_N^{-1}=\left(1-\frac{3}{4N^q}\right)^{-N+1},\\ \sum_{k=1}^{N}A_k^{-1}\alpha_k^{1+2\nu} &= 1+\left(\frac{3}{4N^q}\right)^{2\nu}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N}A_k^{-1}\alpha_k-1\right)=1+\left(\frac{3}{4N^q}\right)^{2\nu}\left(A_N^{-1}-1\right),\end{aligned}$$

which together with (3.28) and (3.29) clearly imply (3.34) and (3.35). Similarly to the proof of Corollary 7.b), we obtain (3.36) and (3.37). ∎

It should be mentioned that the framework of Algorithm 3 cannot be directly generalized to the stochastic setting. More specifically, since we do not know the exact value of the objective function Ψ, the comparison operation in step 2 of this algorithm requires much additional effort under stochastic setting. Hence, we use two different stepsize policies for both nonconvex and strongly convex cases in the above result which lead to two different complexity bounds. In the next result, we specify these bounds for each stepsize policy by appropriately choosing the batch sizes in each iteration of Algorithm 5.

Corollary 15 *Suppose that the sequence $\{x_k,y_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 5, the feasible set X is bounded, and batch sizes are set to*

$$b_k=\tilde{b}_\epsilon=\left\lceil\frac{210\sigma^2}{\mu^2\epsilon}\right\rceil\quad\forall k\geq 1 \tag{3.39}$$

for a given accuracy $\epsilon>0$.

a) If the stepsizes are set to (3.31) and the iteration limit is set to

$$N=N_3(\epsilon)=\left\lceil\max\left\{\left(\frac{82(D_0+\mu\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\nu^2)}{\mu\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}},\left(\frac{280\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\nu}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q\nu}}\right\}\right\rceil$$

for some $D_0\geq\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*$, $\tilde{D}_X\geq D_X$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\nu=\frac{L_\nu\tilde{D}_X^\nu}{\mu(1+\nu)}$, then the total required number of calls to the stochastic oracle to have $\mathbb{E}\left[\|g_{X,R}\|^2\right]\leq\epsilon$ is bounded by

$$\tilde{b}_\epsilon N_3(\epsilon)=\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)\sigma^2}{\mu^2\epsilon}\left(\left[\frac{\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*}{\mu\epsilon}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-q}}+\left[\frac{L_\nu D_X^\nu}{\mu\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right]^{\frac{2}{1-q}}+\left[\frac{L_\nu D_X^\nu}{\mu\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right]^{\frac{1}{q\nu}}\right), \tag{3.40}$$

where $P_R(\cdot)$ is given by (3.24).
If the stepsizes are set to (2.62) and the iteration limit is set to

$$N=N_4(\epsilon)=\left\lceil\max\left\{e^{\frac{53D_0}{\mu\epsilon}},e^{\frac{46(3/2)^{2\nu}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\nu^2}{\nu\epsilon}}\right\}\right\rceil,$$

then the above complexity bound is changed to

$$\tilde{b}_\epsilon N_4(\epsilon)=\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)\sigma^2}{\mu^2\epsilon}\left(e^{\frac{\Psi(x_0)-\Psi^*}{\mu\epsilon}}+e^{\frac{L_\nu^2D_X^{2\nu}}{\mu^2\epsilon}}\right). \tag{3.41}$$

b) If f is convex, an optimal solution x^* exists for problem (1.1), the stepsizes are set to (3.31), and the iteration limit is set to

$$N = N_5(\epsilon) = \left\lceil \max\left\{ \left(\frac{4}{3} \ln \frac{35(\tilde{D}_0^2 + 64\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\nu^2)}{\epsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}, \left(\frac{40\sqrt{10} \cdot 3^{\nu/2} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\nu}{2^\nu \sqrt{\epsilon}} \right)^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} \right\} \right\rceil,$$

then the complexity bound in (3.40) is slightly improved to

$$\tilde{b}_\epsilon N_5(\epsilon) = \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)\sigma^2}{\mu^2 \epsilon} \left(\left[\ln \frac{\mu^2 D_X^2 + L_\nu^2 D_X^{2\nu}}{\mu^2 \epsilon} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-q}} + \left[\frac{L_\nu D_X^\nu}{\mu\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right]^{\frac{1}{q\nu}} \right), \tag{3.42}$$

where $P_R(\cdot)$ is given by (3.27). Moreover, this bound guarantees $\mathbb{E}[\Psi(y_R) - \Psi(x^*)] \leq \mu\epsilon$.
If the stepsizes are set to (2.62) and the iteration limit is set to

$$N = N_6(\epsilon) = \left\lceil \max\left\{ \left(\frac{210\tilde{D}_0^2}{\epsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \left(\frac{180\sqrt{14} \cdot 3^{\nu/2} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\nu}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\nu}} \right\} \right\rceil,$$

then the above complexity bound is changed to

$$\tilde{b}_\epsilon N_6(\epsilon) = \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)\sigma^2 D_X}{\mu^2 \epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} + \left[\frac{L_\nu}{\mu\sqrt{\epsilon}} \right]^{\frac{1}{\nu}} \right). \tag{3.43}$$

Proof. Similarly to the proof of Corollary 12, by replacing the choices of $b = \tilde{b}_\epsilon$ and $N_i(\epsilon)$ $i = 3, 4, 5, 6$ in Corollary 14, we easily obtain the above results. ∎

We now add a few remarks about the above result. First, note that while the complexity bound in (3.40) is obtained without knowing the level of smoothness of f, it can be improved to

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)\sigma^2}{\mu(\mu\epsilon)^{\frac{1+4\nu}{2\nu}}} \left([\Psi(x_0) - \Psi^*]^{\frac{1+2\nu}{2\nu}} + (L_\nu D_X^\nu / \sqrt{\mu})^{\frac{1+2\nu}{\nu}} \right) \tag{3.44}$$

with the choice of $q = 1/(1+2\nu)$ used to obtain its counterpart for deterministic setting when ν is known. To the best of our knowledge, this appears to be the first complexity result in weakly smooth nonconvex stochastic optimization. Note however, that when f is smooth, the above bound is slightly worse than the best-known complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^2)$ obtained in (3.21) for stochastic first-order methods. Also note that the complexity bound in (3.44) is much worse than the one in (3.40) which implies that the stepsize policy in (2.62) is not appropriate for nonconvex optimization.

Second, observe that the complexity bound in (3.42) also depends on q which together with the aforementioned choice of q when ν is known, is reduced to

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)\sigma^2}{\mu^2 \epsilon} \left(\left[\ln \left(D_X^2/\epsilon + \frac{L_\nu^2 D_X^{2\nu}}{\mu^2 \epsilon} \right) \right]^{\frac{1+2\nu}{2\nu}} + \left[\frac{L_\nu^2 D_X^{2\nu}}{\mu^2 \epsilon} \right]^{\frac{1+2\nu}{2\nu}} \right),$$

which is still worse than (3.43) when the second terms in both bounds are the dominating ones. This observation suggests the choice of stepsize in (2.62) for Algorithm 5 when the problem is strongly convex (f is convex). Moreover, the complexity bound in (3.43) appears to be the first one for the stochastic methods applied to weakly smooth strongly convex problems. Note however, that when $\nu = 1$, this bound will be $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}})$ which is worse than the lower bound $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ obtained in (3.23)(with an extra logarithmic constant).

In the rest of this section, we want to obtain a complexity bound for weakly smooth strongly convex stochastic optimization which is automatically optimal if f in (1.1) turns out to be smooth. To do so, we exploit the shrinking multi-stage framework used in the previous section for deterministic setting.

Algorithm 6 The shrinking multi-stage RSCGT algorithm

Input: $w_0 \in X$, $d_0 = D_X$, $t = 0$, and $\tilde{x}_0 = \tilde{y}_0 = w_0$.

For $s = 1, 2, \ldots$**:**

Set $x_0 = w_{s-1}$ and

$$N_s = \left\lceil \max \left\{ 3\sqrt{2}, 6 \left[\frac{48\sqrt{10}L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu d_{s-1}^{(1-\nu)}} \right]^{\frac{1}{\nu}} \right\} \right\rceil. \tag{3.45}$$

For $k = 1, 2, \ldots, N_s$

0. Set the initial points $y_0 = x_0$.
1. Compute $\bar{G}(y_{k-1}, \xi_k)$ according to (3.1) with

$$b_k = \left\lceil \left(\frac{2\sqrt{5}\sigma}{\mu d_{s-1}} \right)^2 \right\rceil \tag{3.46}$$

and set

$$x_k = \arg \min_{u \in X_{s-1}} \left\{ \langle \bar{G}(y_{k-1}), u \rangle + h(u) \right\}, \tag{3.47}$$

where X_s is defined in (2.74).

2. Choose α_k according to (2.62) and set y_k to (2.2).

End

Set $w_s = y_{R_s}$ and $d_s = d_{s-1}/\sqrt{2}$, where R_s is a random variable chosen from $\{1, 2, \ldots, N_s\}$ according to the PMF given by (3.27).

End

Note that in Algorithm 6, similar to its deterministic counterpart presented in the last part of Section 2, we assume that the problem parameters are known. Moreover, in each stage of this algorithm, we call the stochastic oracle b_k times Steps 1.

Next result shows the convergence properties of Algorithm 6.

Corollary 16 *Suppose that the sequence $\{w_s\}_{s \geq 0}$ is generated by Algorithm 6 and feasible set X is bounded. Moreover, assume that f is convex and an optimal solution x^* exists for problem (1.1). Then for any $s \geq 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|g_{X,R_s}\|^2 \right] \leq \frac{24 D_X^2}{2^s}, \tag{3.48}$$

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\Psi(w_s) - \Psi(x^*) \right] \leq \frac{\mu D_X^2}{2^{s+1}}, \tag{3.49}$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to ξ and $[R_1, \ldots, R_s]$ such that each R_s is distributed over $\{1, 2, \ldots, N_s\}$ and its PMF is given by (3.27).

Proof. Noting (3.37) and (3.46), similarly to the proof of Corollary 8, we can show by induction that the shrinking procedure preserve the optimal solution x^*. By following the same arguments in that proof, we can also easily obtain (3.48) and (3.49) ∎

Observe that (3.48) implies that to find an ϵ-stationary point of problem (1.1), the number of stages Algorithm 6 should be set to $\mathcal{O}(1)\log(D_X^2/\epsilon)$. Using this observation, (3.45) and (3.46), we conclude that the

total number of calls to the $\mathcal{SO}$ is bounded by

$$\sum_{s=1}^{S}\sum_{k=1}^{N_s} b_k \leq \sum_{s=1}^{S}\sum_{k=1}^{N_s}\left[1+\left(\frac{2\sqrt{5}\sigma}{\mu d_{s-1}}\right)^2\right] = \sum_{s=1}^{S}\left[N_s + N_s\left(\frac{2\sqrt{5}\sigma}{\mu d_{s-1}}\right)^2\right]$$
$$\leq \sum_{s=1}^{S}\left[6+6\left(\frac{48\sqrt{10}L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu d_{s-1}^{(1-\nu)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\nu}} + \left(\frac{2\sqrt{5}\sigma}{\mu}\right)^2\left(\frac{6}{d_{s-1}^2}+6\left(\frac{48\sqrt{10}L_\nu}{(1+\nu)\mu d_{s-1}^{(1+\nu)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\nu}}\right)\right]$$
$$= \mathcal{O}(1)\left[\log\left(\frac{D_X^2}{\epsilon}\right) + \left(\frac{L_\nu}{\mu\epsilon^{\frac{1-\nu}{2}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\nu}} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu^2\epsilon} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\mu^2}\left(\frac{L_\nu}{\mu\epsilon^{\frac{1+\nu}{2}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\nu}}\right], \tag{3.50}$$

where the last equality follows similarly to (2.78). The same bound guarantees $\Psi(\bar{x}) - \Psi(x^*) \leq \mu\epsilon$ for some $\bar{x} \in X$ due to (3.49). Note that this bound is better than the one in (3.43) and reduced to the optimal complexity $\mathcal{O}(1/\epsilon)$ when f is smooth.

It is worth noting that similar to Step 3 of Algorithm 4, we can incorporate one more step into each stage of Algorithm 6 to establish its convergence when f is possibly nonconvex. However, in this case we need to call the $\mathcal{SO}$ extra times which implies that the complexity our method will be even worse than the one in (3.44). Hence, for sake of simplicity, we only present Algorithm 6 for strongly convex problems.

It should be also pointed out that while all of the complexity bounds of the algorithms in this section are presented for expectation results, we can simply use Markov's inequality to provide similar bounds to have $\text{Prob}\left\{\|g_{X,R}\|^2 \geq \epsilon\right\} \leq \Lambda$ in a single run of these algorithms. In particular, these large-deviation bounds are obtained with replacing ϵ by $\epsilon\Lambda$ in their associated expectation complexity bounds. However, we can improve dependence of these bounds on Λ by designing a two-phase variant of the RSCGT method which consists of several runs of the RSCGT method in the first phase and choosing the best solution among these runs as the output in the second phase (see e.g., [9, 12] for similar two-phase variants of randomized stochastic (projected) gradient method for smooth problems in more details).

4 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we present a conditional gradient type methods for solving a class of composite nonlinear optimization problems defined in (1.1). Existence of the strongly convex term h in the objective function is a basis for our analysis. More specifically, it allows us to have a unified analysis for both nonconvex and strongly convex problems in the sense that our proposed method achieves the best-known complexity for nonconvex problems, and its convergence rate is (nearly) optimal if f is (weakly) smooth and convex. We also present a few variants of this method which do not require the knowledge of problem parameters. Since there is no stepsize involved in the subproblems of these methods, their computational efforts are much cheaper per iteration than those of the existing parameter free proximal type methods. Moreover, we consider problem (1.1) under stochastic setting where only noisy information of f is available and provide complexity of our generalized methods to this setting. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that such complexity results are presented for weakly smooth stochastic optimization.

References

[1] C. Cartis, N. I. M. Gould, and P. L. Toint, *On the complexity of steepest descent, newton's and regularized newton's methods for nonconvex unconstrained optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 20(6) (2010), pp. 2833–2852.

[2] O. Chapelle, V. Sindhwani, and S. S. Keerthi, *Optimization techniques for semi-supervised support vector machines*, Journal of Machine Learning Research, 9 (2008), pp. 203–233.

[3] C. D. Dang and G. Lan, *Stochastic block mirror descent methods for nonsmooth and stochastic optimization*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, (2015). to appear.

[4] J. C. Dunn, *Rates of convergence for conditional gradient algorithms near singular and nonsingular extremals*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 17(2) (1979), pp. 674–701.

[5] ——, *Convergence rates for conditional gradient sequences generated by implicit step length rules*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 18(5) (1980), p. 473487.

[6] M. Frank and P. Wolfe, *An algorithm for quadratic programming*, Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, 3 (1956), pp. 95–110.

[7] D. Garber and E. Hazan, *A Linearly Convergent Conditional Gradient Algorithm with Applications to Online and Stochastic Optimization.*, ArXiv e-prints, (2013).

[8] S. Ghadimi and G. Lan, *Optimal stochastic approximation algorithms for strongly convex stochastic composite optimization, II: shrinking procedures and optimal algorithms*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 23 (2013), pp. 2061–2089.

[9] ——, *Stochastic first- and zeroth-order methods for nonconvex stochastic programming*, SIAM Journal on Optimization, 23(4) (2013), pp. 2341–2368.

[10] ——, *Accelerated gradient methods for nonconvex nonlinear and stochastic optimization*, Mathematical Programming, (2015). DOI: 10.1007/s10107-015-0871-8.

[11] S. Ghadimi, G. Lan, and H. Zhang, *Mini-batch stochastic approximation methods for constrained nonconvex stochastic programming*, Mathematical Programming, (2014). DOI: 10.1007/s10107-014-0846-1.

[12] ——, *Generalized uniformly optimal methods for nonlinear programming*, manuscript, Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA, August 2015.

[13] Y. Grandvalet and Y. Bengio, *Semi-supervised learning by entropy minimization*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS) 17, (2005).

[14] J. Guélat and P. Marcotte, *Some comments on wolfe's 'away step'*, Mathematical Programming, 35(1) (1986), pp. 110–119.

[15] Z. Harchaoui, A. Juditsky, and A. S. Nemirovski, *Conditional gradient algorithms for machine learning*, NIPS OPT workshop, 2012.

[16] M. Ito, *New results on subgradient methods for strongly convex optimization problems with a unified analysis*, manuscript, Department of Mathematical and Computing Sciences, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Japan, Tokyo, April 2015.

[17] M. Jaggi, *Revisiting frank-wolfe: Projection-free sparse convex optimization*, in the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning, 2013.

[18] T. Jensen, J. H. Jørgensen, P. Hansen, and S. Jensen, *Implementation of an optimal first-order method for strongly convex total variation regularization*, BIT Numerical Mathematics, (2012), pp. 329–356.

[19] G. Lan, *Bundle-level type methods uniformly optimal for smooth and non-smooth convex optimization*, Mathematical Programming, 149(1) (2015), p. 145.

[20] ——, *The complexity of large-scale convex programming under a linear optimization oracle*, manuscript, Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA, June 2013. Available on http://www.optimization-online.org.

[21] R. Luss and M. Teboulle, *Conditional gradient algorithms for rank one matrix approximations with a sparsity constraint*, SIAM Review, 55 (2013), pp. 65–98.

[22] L. Mason, J. Baxter, P. Bartlett, and M. Frean, *Boosting algorithms as gradient descent in function space*, Proc. NIPS, 12 (1999), pp. 512–518.

[23] A. S. Nemirovski and D. Yudin, *Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization*, Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics, John Wiley, XV, 1983.

[24] A. S. Nemirovskii and Y. E. Nesterov, *Optimal methods for smooth convex minimization.*, Zh. Vichisl. Mat. Fiz. (In Russian), 25 (1985), pp. 356–369.

[25] Y. E. Nesterov, *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization: a basic course*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Massachusetts, 2004.

[26] ——, *Gradient methods for minimizing composite objective functions*, Mathematical Programming., Series B, 140 (2013), pp. 125–161.

[27] ——, *Universal gradient methods for convex optimization problems*, Mathematical Programming., Series A, (2014). DOI: 10.1007/s10107-014-0790-0.

[28] ——, *Complexity bounds for primal-dual methods minimizing the model of objective function*, tech. report, Februray 2015. CORE Discussion Papers.

[29] O.Devolder, F.Glineur, and Y. E. Nesterov, *First-order methods with inexact oracle: The strongly convex case*, manuscript.

[30] B. N. Pshenichnyi and I. M. Danilin, *Numerical methods in extremal problems.*, Mir Publishers, 1978.

[31] M. Yashtini, *On the global convergence rate of the gradient descent method for functions with Hölder continuous gradients*, Optimization Letter, (2015). DOI: 10.1007/s11590-015-0936-x.

[32] H. Zou and T. Hastie, *Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 67 (2005), pp. 301–320.